Christian Science.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.
BX 6955
Chap. ..... Copyright No. .....
Shelf. M27
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE,

OR

THE FALSE CHRIST OF 1866:

AN EXAMINATION OF THE ORIGIN, ANIMUS, CLAIMS, PHILOSOPHICAL ABSURDITIES, MEDICAL FALLACIES AND DOCTRINAL CONTENTS OF THE NEW GOSPEL OF MENTAL HEALING.

BY

WILLIAM P. McCORKLE,

PASTOR OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, GRAHAM, N. C.

"Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there, believe it not. For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect."—MATT. xxiv. 23, 24.

". . . Profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science, falsely so-called: which some professing have erred concerning the faith."—1 TIMOTHY vi. 20, 21.

RICHMOND, VA.:

THE PRESBYTERIAN COMMITTEE OF PUBLICATION.

TWO COPIES RECEIVED,
Library of Congress,
Office of the
DEC 16 1899
Register of Copyrights.

49895

BX6955
.M27

COPYRIGHT, 1899,

BY

JAS. K. HAZEN, *Secretary of Publication.*

SECOND COPY,

PRINTED BY
WHITTET & SHEPPERSON,
RICHMOND, VA.

81477
Dec. 16. 99.

TO MY WIFE,

LUTIE ANDREWS McCORKLE,

A CHRISTIAN WHO BELIEVES THE "TESTIMONY OF JESUS,"

AND HAS FOUND GOD'S WORD A LAMP UNTO HER FEET

AND A LIGHT UNTO HER PATH,

THIS VOLUME IS DEDICATED.

PREFACE.

In the *Presbyterian Quarterly* of July and October, 1898, and April, 1899, I published a series of papers on Christian Science, covering most of the points discussed in the following pages. The favorable reception accorded to these papers, together with the advice of many friends, encouraged me to rearrange and revise them for publication in permanent form. In doing this, I have added such matter as was necessary to give the reader a complete view of the doctrinal and other contents of the system.

A special reason for a complete refutation of the errors of Christian Science lies in the incoherent and unattractive style of Mrs. Eddy's works. The cultivated reader is apt to turn away from them in sheer weariness and disgust, unless actuated by some specially strong motive in his efforts to wade through her jumbled arguments. Few books have ever been issued from the press that are so hard to comprehend in their statements, so puzzling in their inconsistencies, so illogical in their style, so botched in literary dress, and so brain-addling in their general contents, as are *Science and Health* and *Unity of Good,* Mrs. Eddy's principal works. Most of those who have, to

my knowledge, attempted to read the former have given up the task in despair, bewildered and confused by the author's disconnected style and misty speculations. Ministers are sorely tempted to toss the book aside as being unworthy the attention of intelligent people, and as likely to exert small influence over the public mind. And yet, strange as it may seem, this book, *Science and Health,* is the chief oracle of God in the estimation of a quarter of a million of "Scientists," and is rushing through multiplied editions.

I have written for the pew, rather than for the pulpit. While wishing to give to busy pastors a satisfactory account of this dangerous enemy to revealed truth, I have desired especially to put the matter here given in such shape as to make it readily accessible to the man of business, the house-keeper, and even the school-girl, as well as to the whole multitude who have little taste for theological discussions. Avoiding, as far as possible, all technical terms, and seeking to present the subject in popular style, I have, in my discussion of the doctrinal bearings of the new gospel of healing, endeavored to let the Scriptures speak for themselves, rather than attempt argument on rational and philosophical grounds. I trust that I have succeeded in showing that the system is anti-scriptural in every particular.

Some topics, related to the philosophy of Christian Science, which have been touched upon incidentally in this discussion, deserve much fuller treatment just

at this time, because of their frequent presentation in popular literature. Pantheism, always an intoxicating error, has been widely disseminated in our day. It was the most dangerous element in the religious philosophy of Emerson, and, largely popularized by his essays, now saturates very much of what is supposed to be evangelical preaching. The preëxistence of the human soul, reincarnation, and the final absorption of the human individuality into the Divine essence, are being affirmed, both directly and indirectly, in current poetry and fiction. I trust that some abler pen than mine will give to the church and to the world a refutation of this congeries of errors, which constitutes the back-bone and the digestive system, both of Christian Science and Theosophy.

I would be ungrateful did I not acknowledge my indebtedness to many friends for timely aid and cheering words of encouragement while I was investigating the subject of Christian Science. Their appreciation and approval have inspired me to continue my work in the hope of serving the cause of truth. To Rev. Dr. George Summey, of the Southwestern Presbyterian University, to Mrs. L. J. Moore, of Moulton, Texas, and to Miss Mary L. Atherton, of Boston, I am specially indebted for Christian Science literature, by means of which I have been rendered independent of other writers in my search into the mysteries of the new religion, and enabled to draw my information from original sources. To Rev. G. B.

Strickler, D. D., of Union Seminary, I am under lasting obligations for his kindness in examining the MS. of this volume. His warm approval encouraged me to write, and now encourages me to publish, this defense of the faith.

The volume of Rev. J. M. Buckley, D. D., on *Faith Healing, Christian Science and Kindred Phenomena* is the chief source from which I have drawn my material in discussing the mental healing features of the new gospel, and I count myself very much his debtor. Had he undertaken to present a refutation of Mrs. Eddy's theological vagaries as complete and overwhelming as is his refutation of her mental healing philosophy, my task would have been rendered superfluous. None of the treatises on the subject of Mrs. Eddy's errors have, so far as I am aware, discussed, save in a very fragmentary fashion, her radical departures from evangelical truth, except the little volume of Mr. J. H. Bates on *Christian Science and Its Problems.* This, while it is an admirable discussion of the subject in some of its important bearings, is fatally vitiated by its evolutionary philosophy, by its tacit concessions to the destructive criticism now so popular in some quarters, and, most of all, by its practical abandonment of fundamental truths, such as the doctrines of salvation by grace, the vicarious nature of the atonement, and the necessity of regeneration by the Spirit of God.

In all my quotations from authorities, I have been

careful to give the author's *ipsissima verba.* References have been verified and pains taken to avoid even such inadvertent alterations as are liable to occur in copying. I have also corrected all errors discovered in the papers published in the *Presbyterian Quarterly.* One of these was the statement that, according to Mrs. Eddy, Adam was the man Jesus in a previous incarnation. Further study of her rather Delphic oracle on that point convinces me that what she means to assert is, not that Jesus was Adam, but that he was, in his first incarnation, the first spiritual man, and the first Science healer. The statement in question occurs in one of Mrs. Eddy's tracts, and I have not found it repeated in any of her larger works.

I have been careful to give, in all my principal quotations from *Science and Health,* the wording of the 154th edition of that work. It is possible that some of the choice phrases copied from an older edition, which was my authority for the citations given in my first and second Review papers, may be found altered or missing in the later editions of the book. It is one among many peculiarities of Mrs. Eddy's distinctively feminine inspiration that it always leaves her the womanly prerogative of changing her mind. Comparing the verbiage of the 154th edition with that of the citations referred to, I find that her later inspiration has made her introduce sundry mathematical changes in the way of additions and subtractions, some rhetorical ones in the shape of paraphrases, and

some geographical ones in transposing numerous passages backward or forward to other parts of her book, as suited her sacred whim. These changes made it impossible, in a few instances, to find in the later edition the words quoted from the former. None of the changes which Mrs. Eddy has made in the expression of her doctrines, however, have made any change in the doctrines themselves, which are always more or less indefinite in statement, and always pantheistic in proportion to their clearness. Nor have Mrs. Eddy's frequent revisions added to the literary attractiveness of her great work. They have only served to illustrate the childish ignorance, the feeble reason, and the total lack of literary skill and acumen, which distinguish her above all the popular authors of the day.

This volume was undertaken with a sincere conviction that such an exhibition of the anti-Christian spirit and unscriptural doctrines of Christian Science was needed just at this time, and is now sent forth with an earnest prayer that God may use it for the furtherance of his gospel.

THE MANSE, GRAHAM, N. C.

CONTENTS.

Page.

Introductory—Discussion Necessary, . . . 13

PART I.

General View.

I. A New Gospel and a Growing Church. . 31

II. A Bad Beginning, ... 42

III. A Miraculous Book, ... 48

IV. A New Mariolatry, ... 59

V. Obstacles Removed—The Bible Set Aside and Orthodoxy Repudiated, . . 73

PART II.

Christian Science as a System of Mental Healing.

VI. A Foolish Philosophy and its Absurd Consequences, ... 85

VII. Christian Science and Faith Healing, . 102

VIII. Christian Science vs. Mental Healing by the Medical Faculty, ... 114

IX. Christian Science and Hypnotism, . . 126

PAGE.

X. THE MIRACLES OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE, . . 139

XI. CHRISTIAN SCIENCE PRACTICE, . . . 153

XII. CHRISTIAN SCIENCE FAILURES, . . . 163

XIII. THE INFLUENCE OF THE BODY ON THE MIND, . 169

PART III.

THE DOCTRINAL CONTENTS OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

XIV. AN OLD THEOLOGY IN NEW SHAPE, . . 181

XV. THE GOSPEL OF NO GOSPEL, ... 212

XVI. CHRISTIAN SCIENCE, THEOSOPHY AND GNOSTICISM, ... 245

XVII. CHRISTIAN SCIENCE WORSHIP AND SACRAMENTS, 267

XVIII. MRS. EDDY AS AN EXPOSITOR, . . . 286

XIX. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION, ... 303

Christian Science.

INTRODUCTORY.—DISCUSSION NECESSARY.

That a pseudo-science and a false Christianity, such as those combined in the system exposed in this volume, should gain large credence among intelligent people in this enlightened age, may seem to many a thing incredible. But we cannot forget that ours has been an age of successful imposture, and of contagious delusions. The Millerite craze carried away fifty thousand in its day, and even when the predictions of Miller as to the advent of Christ in 1843 were disappointed—when thousands who had assembled on the hill-tops to meet their Lord as he came, found themselves compelled to doff their ascension robes and return to their homes sadder and wiser men—not even then did the movement cease; it survives to-day in the Seventh Day Adventist Church—a vigorous, aggressive and growing body. That Joseph Smith plagiarized the Book of Mormon from the unpublished manuscript of Rev. Solomon Spaulding, is well known to every well-informed person outside the ranks of Mormonism; and yet that apostate church, thriving on immorality and presenting a bastard Christianity—a church heathenish both in its doctrines and in its practices—now numbers three hundred thousand adherents. It controls the political destinies of three States, is planting its colonies, both

for political and religious ends, wherever the craft of its leaders sees a favorable opening, and is pushing its proselyting missions to the remotest bounds of christendom. "It is growing in the full light of our civilization, thrusting itself into positions of prominence, claiming recognition in our halls of national legislation, and staking its future, with bold confidence and with good reason, on the limitless credulity of nineteenth century humanity."[1] In a later decade the Fox sisters, having discovered that by means of a simple trick they could produce certain rappings, which were accounted mysterious by their mother and neighbors, were encouraged to elaborate a system of deception from which sprung at last the whole fabric of Spiritualism. In 1888 one of the sisters appeared before a New York audience, confessed the imposture, and gave to all who were present a lucid and perfectly satisfactory explanation of the method by which these "spirit-rappings" were produced; but the exposure came too late. Those who had been duped refused to be undeceived, and we are now told that there are a million and a half of Spiritualists in the United States. The still more recent impostures practiced by Madame Blavatsky are notorious; her own confessions are in evidence; and yet the society of which she became the founder, and which began with only fifteen members, now has its hundreds of branches scattered through Christian and through heathen lands, and counts its members by thousands. Far beyond the circle of its immediate influence it is now seeking, through the writings of such gifted visionaries as Marie Corelli and others, to color the literature and shape the thought of this generation.

[1] Rev. R. C. Reed, D. D., in *Presbyterian Quarterly.*

But more shameless than any of these impositions is that practiced by Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy, who claims that in 1866 she received a final revelation from God, to which, after long delay and deep thought—feeling, we presume, that she had both parental and Adamic privileges in being permitted to name the thing—she gave the title of "Christian Science." This new "Science" has in it elements of danger even more pronounced than any of the other impostures mentioned.

It was my intention, when I began to write the papers contained in this volume, to prepare one on "Christian Science" in its relation to the laws of our land, and its status as determined by our courts. Along with Mormonism and certain faith-healing movements, it enjoys the coveted distinction of being liable to be arraigned at any time before our courts in the persons of its followers for violation of the laws of our land. Every State has its health laws, and no "Christian Scientist," unless for reasons of temporary expediency, counts himself under obligation to observe these laws of the Commonwealth in which he lives. The chief purpose of the organization is to heal the sick; and when Judge Pennypacker, of Philadelphia, refused to grant a charter to a "Christian Scientist" Church, that it might be able to hold its property, he based his decision upon the act of the Pennsylvania Legislature prescribing the qualifications of medical practitioners, saying that the granting of a charter would be an infringement of the provisions of that act. The Supreme Court of Rhode Island, following decisions rendered by other courts, decided that "Christian Scientists" were not medical practitioners in the legal sense of the word, and that persons who neglect to send for physicians are liable,

in case of the patient's death, to the penalty prescribed by the law for neglect, no matter how many "Christian Scientists" have been summoned. The issue is thus being squarely drawn. Cases like that of Mrs. Baird, a "Science" healer arrested in Kansas City for failure to report a case of malignant diphtheria which she had treated, are multiplying in every direction. Referring to a "Christian Science" family which refused to comply with the city ordinance requiring houses to be placarded in which there are malignant and contagious diseases, the Kansas City *Star* of January 5, 1897, observed:

> The issue to be decided is whether the ordinances of the city are to prevail in such cases or the peculiar notions of the people who regard the ordinances as an infringement upon their religious liberty. While the institutions of this Republic vouchsafe, in general terms, the privilege to all of worshipping God according to the dictates of their own consciences, there are religions which would not be tolerated in this country. The pagan, who believes with his whole soul in the righteousness and efficacy of human sacrifices, would not be permitted to pursue his barbarous and bloody rites under the American scheme, and the government has declared that polygamy shall not be practiced and perpetuated, even though the followers of Brigham Young may gauge their love for God by the number of their wives.
>
> No religious idea or belief can or will be countenanced in this country which conflicts with the authority of the State or sets out to defy its laws. Our system of government, in all of its details, allows the largest measure of liberty to the citizen which is consistent with the safety of his neighbor, but beyond that it cannot go. While the right of Christian Scientists to withhold medical treatment from members of their own faith may be open to debate, there can be no reasonable difference of opinion as to their responsibility to those regulations which provide in wisdom for the preservation of the public health and the prevention of pestilence.

Stephens, in his Digest of the Criminal Law, declares that "a person is deemed to have committed homicide, although his act is not the sole cause of death, . . . if by any act he hastens the death of a person suffering from any disease or injury which, apart from such act, would have caused death." It was, doubtless, under this law that the coroner's jury in London held Mrs. Athalie Mills and Miss Kate Lyons, two "Scientist" healers, for manslaughter, because of the death, under their treatment, of Harold Frederick, the well-known novelist and newspaper correspondent. According to the testimony, Mr. Frederick died from a malady which would not have resulted seriously if he had been given proper medical attention. Referring to this case, the editor of *Law Notes* remarks:

Christian Scientists, if their methods are interfered with in this country, will doubtless urge that they are not amenable for their acts, because they are merely engaged in a proper exercise of their religious liberty; but we advise them not to lay this flattering unction to their souls. The Supreme Court of the United States has passed upon the identical question in determining the alleged rights of Mormons to practice polygamy in accordance with the tenets of their religion. . . Construing the first amendment to the Constitution, the Supreme Court has declared that it was intended to allow every one to . . . exhibit his sentiments in such forms of worship as he may think proper, "not injurious to others." But the court has emphatically declared: "With man's relations to his Maker, and the obligations he may think they impose, and the manner in which an expression shall be made by him of his belief on these subjects, no interference can be permitted, provided, always, the laws of society, designed to secure its peace and prosperity, and the morals of its people, are not interfered with. However free the exercise of religion may be, it must be subordinate to

the criminal laws of the country passed with reference to actions regarded by general consent as properly the subjects of punitive legislation." In view of these expressions we fail to see how Christian Scientists can hope for any immunity from punishment because of the fact that their so-called scientific operations are sanctioned by and constitute a part of their religion.

These opinions are, I conceive, unquestionably correct. But there is need of active and determined effort everywhere on the part of those who are charged with the preservation of the public health to see that the law is executed. When Mrs. Baird was arrested it was stated in the press dispatches that fifteen hundred Christian Scientists in Kansas City would sustain her. When grown strong, this body of deluded people may plunge whole communities into plagues of cholera, of yellow fever, of diphtheria, small-pox, or any other malignant contagion.

But this is the least of the evils in the practice of Christian Science. It has in it untold possibilities of mischief, morally, socially, and religiously. Morally, it cannot hope to restrain men from sin by telling them they are gods. Socially, it must inevitably produce domestic alienation, divorce and immorality, wherever the contagion of its creed becomes epidemic. Religiously, it is animated by the bitterest hatred toward the whole system of revealed truth, and the whole fabric of Evangelical Christianity.

And yet its first introduction into any community is as the appearance of an angel of light. It comes as a new advent of Christ, the "Sun of Righteousness with healing in his wings." It claims to be primitive Christianity in all and more than its original purity and power,—the true doctrine, purified by revelations

fresh from heaven. It is full of love. It opposes no church, suggests no separation from orthodox bodies. It appeals blandly to the Scriptures to substantiate both its doctrines and its claims. But it bears in its right hand the pruning shears of a Biblical criticism which surpasses the pen-knife methods of all other destructive critics in its ability to reduce the Holy Book to a contemptible fragment of doubtful meaning, while in its left hand it bears the terminology, the cultus and the doctrines of an anti-Christian creed, which strikes viciously at every distinctive Christian doctrine, and makes of the suffering Divine Christ the amiable, but mortal, victim of hypnotic illusions.

This new enemy of the Church of Christ must be met and conquered. This is no time for prophesying smooth things, and for speaking pleasantly of "our Scientist friends," as if we considered them all fellow-Christians, entitled to our confidence, our goodwill, and our Godspeed. Many of them are not Christians; and we should, if possible, open their eyes to the dreadful delusion into which they have fallen, and show them the heathenish origin and the anti-Christian tendency of the doctrines which they have embraced. Away with such sentimental charity as that of the New England pastor who lectured to his congregation on the "Beauties of Christian Science!" As well might he have praised the beauties of Buddhism. There is in this false Christ, who came in 1866, not in the clouds, but out of the befogged brain of a half-crazy woman, no beauty that we should admire him; nor does any voice from heaven say, "Hear ye him." Though men may say, "Lo! here!" or "Lo! there!" we will not heed them. We still

wait for the sign of our Lord's coming, and we will not be disappointed.

Says the Rev. P. P. Flournoy, D. D., the accomplished author of *The Search-Light of St. Hippolytus,* in a letter to the writer, "What I have heard . . . has convinced me that this heresy is a menace, especially to bright and earnest Christian women, such as scarcely any other has ever been. . . I think that you could perform a great service for Christ our Lord and for some of the choicest of his flock by publishing your proposed book." This was encouraging, but it was not echoed on every hand. Many will agree with the venerable ex-professor of one of our Seminaries, who wrote to the son of his old friend, "Christian Science is not founded on reason, and cannot be met by reason." With all deference to my revered and learned friend, I must beg to dissent from his second proposition, though fully agreeing with his first. It is *not* founded on reason, and therefore it *can* be met by reason. If it were founded on reason, it would be folly to assail it. But inasmuch as it is founded on fallacious *reasoning* rather than on true *reason,* this fact encourages me to attempt its refutation. I have confidence in the reason of the average man or woman. I do not believe it will ever be useless to show the fallacies of false systems. The light is its own evidence, even though it shine in the darkness and the darkness comprehend it not. Some will come to the light, that their "deeds may be manifest that they are wrought in God." Reason can confound unreason. Facts which *do* prove one doctrine will be stronger to convince rational minds than facts which are only *supposed* to prove another, and which are shown to be inconclusive. Since, then, a new assault

is now being made upon the "faith once delivered to the saints," and we are bidden to "contend earnestly" for our precious heritage, we should be at this time, as always, ready to give a reason for the hope that is in us. Falsely accused of mutilating the gospel, and charged with hypocrisy, we may at least show our good conscience by exhibiting the grounds upon which we reject and contemn this alleged revelation recommended to us by one whose claim to plenary inspiration is refuted by the ever-changing character of her oracles, which shift as we look upon them, like the phantasmagoria of dreams.

There is, in our time, especially in Christian churches, an intense opposition to controversy; and I have been led to suspect that it is rather an opposition to polemics in *defense* of the faith than to those which assail the most venerable articles of our religion. It is not infrequently said that controversy is always hurtful. Those who take this ground forget the plainest lessons taught by the history of the church. Christianity was nurtured, not only by the fires of persecution, but by the heat of controversy. All that its first believers desired was a hearing, and they "declared the word with all boldness," alike in the audience of the people, and before the judgment seats of kings. Peter's sermon at Pentecost was controversial, and while it won a multitude of converts to the faith, it also threw down the gauntlet to priest and Pharisee, and helped him to a prison. A little later we see this bold defender of the faith facing the Sanhedrim, and taking advantage of a prisoner's opportunity of defense in order to urge the claims of Christ upon rulers and elders. The deacon Stephen declared the gospel to a howling mob, though he died

a martyr for his pains. Paul, we read, "disputed in the synagogue" at Athens with the Jews and devout persons, and when challenged by Epicureans and Stoics was ready to stand on Mars' Hill and defend the blessed gospel of the resurrection. We are told of at least one philosopher who was converted by that sermon, who afterwards, if Eusebius is correct, became pastor of the Athenian church. Again, at Ephesus, Paul is found "disputing daily in the school of one Tyrannus." Thus did this great apostle everywhere. Whether opposed by priest or philosopher, by Jew or Greek, whether arraigned before the Jerusalem Sanhedrim or Roman governors, he embraced every opportunity to defend the truth, and to urge the claims of the gospel of redemption. He was but one of many; and while his epistles have been said to bear, more than any other Scriptures, the marks of the many controversies in which their author was engaged, the epistles of Peter, of John, of James and of Jude, all show the same peculiarity. John is said to have written his story, the most precious of the gospel narratives, for the purpose of refuting the heresy of Cerinthus. His first epistle reveals the same object, and he rebukes another Gnostic sect in the second chapter of the Apocalypse. True gospel preaching, if I catch the meaning of these facts, ought to take account of every form of error as it rises, and show its opposition to the truth as it is in Jesus. Thus only can we keep that which has been committed to us, and prevent the "oppositions" of false systems from working serious injury to the church. When it comes to pass that the ministry cannot defend the truth and attack error in its strongholds without injuring the church, it will be high time for the ministry to have

a new gospel to preach, or else for the church to have new men to preach the old gospel.

Not only did primitive Christianity gain its triumphs largely through controversy, but in every age evangelical truth has been the gainer by its fearless attacks upon error. If the life of Protestantism in Germany was saved by the swords of the Protestant princes during the thirty years' war, that life was born of gospel seed sown in the controversial sermons and anti-papal tracts of Luther and his coadjutors. The age of the Reformation was preëminently an age of polemic pamphlets and of public discussion. The confessions of the Reformed churches were forged in the fires of heated controversy. The proceedings of the Westminster Assembly may be described as a battle of giants day after day and month after month. Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, Beza, Tyndale and Knox spent their lives in controversy.

Truth wins its victories in the light of day, while error runs its errands in the dark. False systems thrive on the drowsy indifference, the somnolent peace, and the time-serving caution of those whom God has appointed guardians of His truth. Had those who knew the facts been able to meet Mormonism face to face in its early days, and show the evidence of Smith's fraud, that foul heresy would have been crippled, if not destroyed, for all time. While persecution popularizes, and the blood of martyrs may become the seed even of an apostate church, the public refutation of error drives it into hiding. Romanism has long ago learned to avoid discussion with Protestants, and with caution born of sad experience now adopts the easier arts of smiling peace and private deception. Mormon missionaries and Advent-

ists forsake a neighborhood in which their tenets have been exposed and refuted. Spiritualism shuns the light of day, and Theosophy must needs depend upon the tricks of oriental jugglers and letters from Thibet. And what has been found to be true of other classes of errorists will be true also of Christian Scientists. They will not come out boldly into the light. They will not risk all upon the judgment of an enlightened people. Their protests against the replies which they themselves have challenged, their carefully indefinite references to certain cases of healing, their reiterated pleas for Christian charity, their loud professions of love for humanity, and their cant about religious freedom, all show their unwillingness to meet the issue squarely and fairly. Since the writer began to publish the results of his investigations into the origin and character of Mrs. Eddy's new gospel, he has received letters protesting against his "attacks" upon Christian Science, and pleading for the recognition of that church as a Christian organization, working for the good of humanity. He has also received sundry papers from anonymous sources, sent by pious Scientists for his enlightenment, but, greatly to his satisfaction, furnishing him with valuable weapons for his arsenal. The galled jade winces, and the scourge of small cords which we are able to draw from our unmutilated Bibles is found to have a longer reach and a sharper lash than the scourge of Science with which Mrs. Eddy proposes to whip us all out of the Temple of God.

I have been led to surmise that in this last revival of ancient heresy the Church of Christ may be suffering chastisement for its efforts to compromise with

the enemies of the truth. Christian Science had its birth not far from a city in which some twenty years ago a popular preacher—since sunk to the more fitting station of a horse jockey—declared that he could not preach the doctrine of eternal punishment, because the people had laughed it to scorn. It is unquestionably true that for more than forty years the effort to convert souls and train Christians by the preaching of the gospel has been largely abandoned in favor of humanitarian schemes and sociological discussions. Unitarianism and Universalism have grown strong side by side, and in brotherly fellowship, with an evangelical pulpit which for five decades has devoted much of its time to political propagandism. It is significant of the trend of ministerial opinion that the *Homiletic Review* for this month of June, 1899, recommends that ministers adopt the advice of Professor Commons, and devote the Sunday evening service to "a course of sermons on Sociology." In the judgment of such writers, "Christ and Him crucified" is not a sufficient theme for the evening service, and something better must be found.

It is believed that the discussion of this new form of error in our pulpits and in the columns of the religious and secular press will give a grand opportunity to present, to a thoroughly interested reading public, a restatement of the fundamental doctrines of the gospel, and an exhibition of the character and proofs of Scriptural inspiration. The vantage ground of every form of error is discovered in the crude and childish notions of evangelical teaching which are often cherished even by cultivated men and women. The old catechetical system has passed away, and a generation has grown up which knows not the doc-

trines of grace as they were known to our fathers. The exact definitions of the Westminster Confession are to-day in an unknown tongue to many who have grown up in our Presbyterian congregations, and our home mission work is bringing in multitudes who need to be instructed in the "form of sound words."

The labor expended in honest and prayerful defense of the truth will not be spent in vain. If the light of Scripture and of reason were everywhere turned upon the dangerous errors of this most un-Christian creed of the century, such an exposure would be sufficient to turn back into the way of truth many who have been led astray by the vaunted miracles and specious claims of Christian Science healers; while others, being forewarned, would be forearmed against assaults upon their faith.

And, far beyond the recovery of those who are being led into the barren mountains of Pantheistic speculation, and into the hopeless quagmires of the mental healing lunacy, is the good that may be accomplished in the revival of interest in the pure gospel, and the awakening of the church to a sounder and stronger life. We have passed through whole decades of revivalism, in which emotional stories and shallow exhortations have taken the place of old-fashioned gospel preaching, with its pictures of the majesty of Sinai and the heinousness of sin, its terrible appeal to the conscience and the reason, and its tender pleadings with the unrenewed heart. "Men now repent," said an old Methodist preacher in the writer's hearing many years ago, "who have not felt that they are sinners; they are converted without being born again, and they exercise faith without really trusting in Christ." There is truth in this lamentable confes-

sion. A higher type of religious experience is needed, which will cut off the demand for such efforts as the Keswick movement. Higher life comes from assimilation of the truth. And truth is never so commanding as when shown in contrast with error. The Bible is never so majestic as when it is brought to the stand to testify in its own behalf against the hoary falsehoods of ages. Nor can we, who believe in our Lord's ever-presence with His church, doubt that He will shed forth the Spirit of His grace, and add His omnipotent testimony to the preaching of the Word, and His infallible demonstrations to the witness of His servants.

PART I.

GENERAL VIEW.

I.

A NEW GOSPEL AND A GROWING CHURCH

"A HIGHER and more practical Christianity stands at the door of this age knocking for admission." "Above Arcturus and his sons, broader than the universe and higher than the heavens of your astronomy, stands the Science of mental healing." Mortals cabined, cribbed, and confined by all orthodox doctrines as to man's nature and destiny, are like unhatched chickens, and are now exhorted to "peck their shells open with Christian Science and look upward." In these and like swelling words Mrs. Mary Baker Glover Eddy challenges the attention of the Christian world to the "sacred discovery" which she claims to have made.[1]

Nor is her challenge unheeded. Already the sect of which she has become the head and oracle has a very considerable following. The "Mother Church" in Boston, of which she was the founder and first pastor, otherwise called the "First Church of Christ, Scientist," is one of the most flourishing churches in the city. It now numbers more than thirteen hundred resident members, with a total membership, including non-residents, of some 12,000. According to *The Independent,* at the beginning of the year 1898 the whole enrolled membership of the sect was "conservatively placed at from 40,000 to 50,000," while the

[1] *Science and Health,* pp. 120 and 544, and *Christian Science Series,* No. 5, p. 10.

actual number of avowed adherents and church attendants was much larger, being not less than 250,000 in the United States and Canada. A recent writer estimates the number of adherents in the world at 300,000! The official report of the body in 1896 claimed that near 20,000 converts had been made in the United States alone within the previous five years. Its active ministry, classed as "official church readers, missionaries and healers," all of whom devote their whole time to the healing and reformatory work of the new church, was set down at the close of 1896 at more than 6,000. A year later it was reported at over 7,500. This relatively enormous number of propagandists is being, we are told, "rapidly increased by the acquisition of many trained nurses, surgeons and physicians from both schools of medicine, as well as many consecrated men and women from the ranks of mercantile, social, religious and literary life." It was claimed that the attendance upon Christian Science services doubled during the year 1897, and large growth was reported likewise for the year 1898. Its "chartered churches" and "Christian Science Institutes" are multiplying rapidly, and there is hardly a city of importance in our land where this new sect has not a band of zealous workers. It is a well-organized body, with national, State and local societies, all compacted by the cementing power of a spurious sense of Christian brotherhood, and propelled by the energy of a novel and intense enthusiasm. It has already an influential periodical press, edited by men and women of some scholarship, of ability by no means contemptible, and of unflagging industry and zeal. It is prolific of books, booklets and tracts, a few of them written in pleasing literary style, and all

urging the claims of the new doctrines with some show of learning, much apparent sincerity, and with vast plausibility of statement; while under the auspices of its "Board of Lectureship" a number of talented men and women are engaged in canvassing our whole country, proclaiming the new gospel everywhere.

"Christian Science," so-called, professes exceeding reverence for the name of Jesus, and proclaims as its mission the restoration of primitive Christianity through the "healing of the sick and the reformation of the depraved." Its one method, by which all its marvels, both of spiritual and physical healing, are wrought, is declared to be the same by which our Lord wrought all his "so-called miracles."

A more complete misnomer than the name chosen for this new religion could hardly be conceived. It is, in fact, a new heathenism, and has in it no single shred of science, and hardly so much as a scrap of genuine Christianity. As our examination will show, it violates every principle of scientific investigation and of logical thought, and contradicts the plain testimony of the Scriptures touching every cardinal doctrine of the Christian system. It is, however, one of the most curious of the many peculiar religious phenomena of this progressive and scientific age. It is well adapted to the wants of that large class of independent and extraordinary people whose highest ambition is to keep "abreast of the times." Just now the whole world is worshipping Science. The leader of this new movement, wiser in her generation than the children of light, has adopted in her system a terminology than which nothing better for her purpose could have been devised. It splits the ears of groundlings with its show of learning and its pre-

tense of science, while its novelty rivets the attention and compels the faith of that Athenian multitude which is ever desirous to "hear or to tell something new." Indeed, birdlime is scarcely so good a device for trapping the unwary bird as is this new scheme for capturing those who know little of religion and less of science.

It makes its bland appeal to the "scientific" mind. Everything in it is "scientific," seeming to the unlearned and the credulous to savor of patient study, of unwearied research, and of exact methods. It proffers to those who have been vexed with the long talked-of contradictions between Genesis and Geology, the latest and the most "scientific" expositions of Bible history and doctrine. Its cures and conversions, its spiritual victories over sin and temptation, and its manifold wonders which challenge comparison with the miracles of Christ and his apostles, are "demonstrations." Its new Bible, for which plenary inspiration and Divine authority are claimed, is "our text-book." Its basic ideas are presented as "Rudiments and Rules." Its theology is "Metaphysics," and the schools of its prophets are "Metaphysical" or "Christian Science" Academies, Institutes, Colleges, etc. Its theological graduates are graduated, not in theology—possibly because there is a prejudice against theology in this day—but in "Science," and receive the academic degrees of "Doctor of Christian Science," "Bachelor of Divine Science," or the more modest "Christian Scientist," these degrees answering to those of Master and Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Philosophy in our colleges. Thus are all its authoritative expounders vested with badges certifying their proficiency in all

the supposedly abstruse branches of this new "scientific" education.

Its new Divine revelation, and its perennial fountain of living truth and of saving grace, is a book with a prodigiously seductive title. Who could conceive of anything more taking in this practical age, in which health-seeking is the principal occupation of many women and not a few men, than "Science and Health"? "Christian Science" professes to be practical, and proposes to meet the wants of all who desire a practical religion. It comes laden with present blessings for all men and women who are weary and heavy laden with mortal infirmities and desire to enter into "freedom through the truth." Where, indeed, is the "mortal mind" that would not like to be informed of the latest revelations of science, and to learn the secret of unfailing health? Here at last is found the "El Dorado, the Golden Land of Promise, upon whose mountain peaks" of inspired doctrine mortals have "only to gaze in order to be healed."

This, too, is an age of doubt. This new creed offers a satisfactory solution of all the vexing questions started by the materialistic science of the age, and professes to vindicate grandly the spiritual origin and nature of man.

In short, Christian Science is the very latest phase of "advanced thought," the newest fad in rationalistic religion. It comes heralded as an authoritative and final settlement of all questions related to life, duty and destiny, introducing itself as Christian, and, even more than that—lest we should fail to give it all the

[1] Mrs. Woodbury, *War in Heaven,* p. 14.

honor which it demands—as DIVINE Science. It is a brand-new, up-to-date system of religion, designed to meet the wants of all that large class of aspiring souls who have grown weary of "traditional theology," and are just now waiting for some pilot prepared to help them launch out into the deep, and to steer them in their voyage of intellectual and spiritual discovery.

In one important particular, however, the apostles of this new healing and reformatory gospel differ from the apostles of Christ, and from the Master himself. It is not recorded that Jesus or any of His apostles charged any specific fee for instruction in the facts and doctrines of religion, or for miracles of healing. But in this new scientific religion one is, while exempt from any obligation to pray, compelled nevertheless to *pay* as he goes.

The first duty of the Christian Scientist, or even of one desirous of studying the new religion, is to provide himself with a copy of *Science and Health.* Here is the law from the book itself:

> A Christian Scientist requires my work on *Science and Health* for his text-book, and so do all his students and patients. Why? *First,* Because it is the voice of Truth to this age, and contains the whole of Christian Science, or the science of healing through Mind. *Second,* Because it was the first published book containing a statement of Christian Science, gave the first rules for demonstrating this science, and registered this revealed Truth uncontaminated by human hypotheses. Other works, which have borrowed from this book without giving it credit, have adulterated the science. *Third,* Because this work has done more for teacher and student, for healer and patient, than has been accomplished by other works.—*Science and Health,* p. 453.

This is authoritative, and accounts for the fact that such a book as *Science and Health* has been able to reach its hundred and fifty-fourth edition. It is said that a new edition is published every six months, and that every loyal "Scientist" considers himself in duty bound to purchase a copy of the latest edition at the earliest possible moment after it is published. As the book, even in its cheapest form, costs $3.18, postpaid, and is very inexpensively made, it is obvious that Mrs. Eddy's royalties must be considerable. Her other publications—all of which are much used as means of introducing the new creed, as well as of healing the sick—are published at higher prices relatively. The literary ventures of Mrs. Eddy cannot be said to have been failures from a financial standpoint.

Mental healers, not being required to devote any time to the study of such "materialistic" branches as Chemistry, Anatomy, Physiology, and Materia Medica, can qualify themselves for the practice of their profession in a very short time. Fees for tuition, however, are not proportionally less than those charged by medical colleges, but, on the contrary, are very much higher. While Mrs. Eddy was conducting the "Massachusetts Metaphysical College," of which she was the only teacher, save as her labors for a time were shared to a limited extent by her husband, since deceased, her charge for a primary course of twelve lessons, continuing through three weeks, was $300; for the normal course, $200; and for special instruction in Metaphysical Obstetrics, $100; while attendance upon her lectures on Theology and the Bible necessitated the expenditure of $200 additional. Husbands and wives entering the primary class at the

same time were required to pay but half tuition. If they entered at different times, or desired to pursue any of the advanced courses of study, they were required to pay full fees. The highest discount to an indigent student was $100, and this applied only to the first course. It seems to have been presumed that as soon as students completed the primary course they could begin the practice of their profession, and that their success would soon enable them to earn money enough to finish their course and take their degrees. They were instructed to charge their patients, Mrs. Eddy holding, it would seem, that people would value their health and their healers more if required to pay for "treatment." Thus it required at least $800 to enable one to master the abstruse branches of this "scientific" education, exclusive of the trifling matter of board.

Mrs. Eddy conducted her college for eight years, closing it at last, when it was "in the height of its prosperity," and one hundred and sixty applications for admission lay on her desk, in order to devote herself to the task of revising her book.[1] During the first years of her career as a teacher she also did much

[1] A writer in the *Arena* of May, 1899, intimates that possibly Mrs. Eddy may have been influenced by other considerations in closing her college. "In 1889 Mrs. Eddy ostensibly gave up her college and retired to Concord, N. H., at the very period when a Massachusetts district attorney was looking for evidence of that institution's illegally conferred degrees, of which there were thousands, punishable with a fine of five hundred dollars for each offense. Is this the reason that for ten years Mrs. Eddy has not visited Boston on a week day, when she would be subject to arrest?" This seems to be a very natural inquiry.

ıealing, if we may credit her statements; and so, from he several sources indicated, together with the free-will offerings of patients and students, and a thriving trade in her photographs and souvenir spoons, etc., she has managed to amass a respectable competency. She has built herself a fine residence in Concord, New Hampshire, and having retired from active work, save as the peculiar type of inspiration which possesses her requires frequent revisions of her infallible book, and her unique position as the oracle of a growing sect demands frequent communications, is spending her declining years in comfort. She says much in her works about cross-bearing, crucifixion, and the like, as incidents in the exalted and unselfish life to which she invites her followers; but it is not known that she has ever endured any very great persecutions. She has not, indeed, been warmly welcomed as an ally by the Christian churches and ministry; but she has not been mobbed, nor even hooted by the street gamins at any time, so far as I can learn. It is quite probable that she will at last "die amidst her worshippers," like the error she would fain revive. Her life seems a singular commentary upon the apostle's statement, "All that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution." It is singular also that this lady of means and leisure, whose inspiration is asserted to surpass that of all the prophets who have preceded her, has retired from the practice of her sublime healing art. The following note appears at the end of the preface to her great work: "The author takes no patients, and declines medical consultation." Formerly the notice was, "The authoress takes no patients, and has no

time for medical consultation." She has the time now, we may assume, but chooses to let men suffer and die without any longer sending forth the healing aroma of her thought, save as that is dispensed in her various works. There is considerable contrast between this wealthy and much idolized widow and those great men of the past who, in poverty and in obscurity, became founders of great religious and philosophical systems, and, most of all, between her and One who "had not where to lay His head."

Many Christian Science institutes have sprung up in various parts of our land, and their charges, while never as large as those of the Founder of their Science, are sufficient to astonish the professors of our medical colleges when the brevity of the course is considered. At one time there were certain teachers who offered to communicate all they knew, with the privilege of conversation once a month for a year, on payment of $100. Rivalries among the various Mental Healing schools have led to the practice of denying recognition to all who do not advertise in the *Christian Science Journal.* This plan has the double advantage of securing a considerable advertising patronage for the periodical, and at the same time warning the public against false teachers of the Divine Science. Many of those who have graduated under the instructions of Mrs. Eddy and her pupils have achieved notoriety as healers, and have been greatly prospered. The lucrative character of Christian Science practice may have something to do with the amazing industry of those who are engaged in propagating the new creed. Their campaign is waged on principles somewhat different from those

which were adopted by the first preachers of the cross; and the bait which the devil offered to Christ in his temptation is held steadily before the great army of Christian Scientists. They confidently expect to gain "all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them."

II.

A BAD BEGINNING.

If it be true that "a bad beginning makes a good ending," and if it be also true that the blessedness of the ending is always proportional to the badness of the beginning, Christian Science is destined to shine like the sun in an eternal blaze of glory. Its antecedents are suspicious in the extreme. Its origin, according to the statement of its founder, was in humbuggery, patent and confessed. Mrs. Eddy is a native of New Hampshire, and alleges that for more than thirty years she was a member in good standing of the Congregational Church in the town of Tilton. She was a homœopathic physician. Her "experiments in homœopathy had made her skeptical as to material curative methods." Two of these experiments she relates with charming *naivetè*. In one she "attenuated common table salt until there was not a single saline property left." Putting a drop of that attenuation in a goblet of water, and administering a teaspoonful dose of this medicated water every three hours, she succeeded in curing a patient who was sinking in the last stages of typhoid fever! The other experiment was even more wonderful. The patient was in the last stages of dropsy; had been tapped; "looked like a barrel." Mrs. Eddy prescribed "the fourth attenuation of *Argenitum Nitricum,* with occasional doses of a high attenuation of *Sulphuris.*" The patient improved perceptibly. Fearing an unfavorable reaction from the prolonged use of these very dangerous remedies, Mrs. Eddy desired to

change her treatment, and so informed the patient. The latter, however, objecting, Mrs. Eddy, unwilling to risk reaction, continued her treatment by slyly administering the *unmedicated pellets,* and thus effected a cure!—*Science and Health,* pp. 46, 49. Others, whose minds reason normally, would have concluded from these experiments, not that all medicine was useless, but that cases which could be cured by homœopathy could be cured as well without medicine; but Mrs. Eddy was thus led to see in the "metaphysics" of "Christian Science" the "next stately step beyond homœopathy."—*Ibid.,* p. 50.[1]

[1] *Apropos* of the fact that Mrs. Eddy graduated into Christian Science "discovery and revelation" from the ranks of homœopathy, we are reminded of Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes' opinion of homœopathy as given in his *Medical Essays.* It is, he says, "a pretended science, . . . a mingled mass of perverse ingenuity, of tinsel erudition, of imbecile credulity, and of artful misrepresentation, too often mingled in practice, if we may trust the authority of its founder, with heartless and shameless imposition." Mrs. Eddy's account of her own homœopathic practice bears out the doctor fully. It may be noted that in speaking of her success in healing with unmedicated pellets and with diluted salt water she mentions it quite as a matter of course, and shows no sign of any moral compunction in view of her own humbuggery. On the contrary, she regards homœopathy as "stately," and her own "sacred discovery" as another "stately step" beyond what she herself has shown to be palpable humbuggery. It is, indeed, a somewhat more "stately" imposition upon public credulity.

Another remark of Dr. Holmes is pertinent: "The pseudosciences, phrenology and the rest, it seems to me, only appeal to weak minds and the weak points of strong ones. There is a *pica,* or false appetite, in many intelligences; they take to odd fancies in place of wholesome truth, as girls gnaw at chalk and charcoal."—*Medical Essays,* p. 245.

In her revolt against the use of drugs, our new reformer was further encouraged by the outspoken skepticism of Dr. Benjamin Rush and sundry other eminent medical men as to the value of their own science. Among numerous startling opinions she quotes that of "Dr. James Johnson, Surgeon Extraordinary to the King," to the effect that if there were not a single physician, surgeon, apothecary, man midwife, chemist, druggist, or drug, in the world, there would be less sickness and less mortality. She was then, according to her own testimony, a conscious quack, deeming all other practitioners equally dishonest with herself, and fully convinced that all drugs were worthless. While in this state of mind she began to muse on the healing practiced in the primitive church, together with the admitted fact that the mind has much to do with both the cause and cure of disease. At last, she avers, when desperately ill, and "standing within the shadow of the death-valley," she lighted upon her marvelous discovery, and received her call to become the prophetess of a new dispensation.[1]

Justice to the facts of the case, however, demands the statement that some four years prior to her alleged "discovery" of Christian Science, Mrs. Eddy was for many months under the treatment of one Dr. Phineas P. Quimby, whom she admits to have been "a distinguished mesmerist," with some "advanced views about mental healing." This fact has given rise, even in the ranks of so-called Christian Scientists, to much acrimonious discussion, many holding that she is indebted to Dr. Quimby for the chief points of her system, and that her claim to exclusive

[1] *Science and Health,* pp. 2, 3.

originality, revelation, etc., is not altogether unquestionable. Among the latest who have appeared in the lists challenging the proofs of Mrs. Eddy's originality is Mrs. Josephine Curtis Woodbury, formerly one of her most devoted adherents, but now an independent teacher of Mental Healing. In a letter published in the *Bangor* (Me.) *News* of December 6, 1898, Mrs. Woodbury says that the leading ideas of *Science and Health* are "borrowed from various writers, chiefly from the late Dr. Phineas P. Quimby, of Portland, Maine."

"Dr. Quimby was an original thinker, and achieved marked success as a healer along mental lines years before Mrs. Eddy (then Mrs. Glover or Mrs. Patterson), afflicted with a disease in the nature of palsy, 'turned in despair from materia medica' and sought the doctor's aid.

"In the *Christian Science Journal* for June, 1887, Mrs. Eddy states, over her own signature, that she was under Dr. Quimby's treatment from 1862 till his death in 1865. Mrs. Eddy further states in the same journal that in 1865 she was so well under Dr. Quimby's treatment that she believed herself healed. 'I wrote and talked,' so she affirms, 'as if his method must be genuine science, and was too proud to think it could be anything else.'

"In writings only recently examined I find a series of articles dating from 1841 to 1865, written in some instances by Dr. Quimby himself, and in others by his patients and pupils, some of them being printed in the newspapers in various towns and cities of Maine.

"The ideas thus promulgated were then credited to Dr. Quimby, even by Mrs. Eddy herself; but in 1875 we find them incorporated into *Science and Health* as part of a 'special revelation' to its author." [1]

[1] In the paper in the *Arena* for May, 1899, just now quoted, Mrs. Woodbury united with Horatio Dresser in presenting

Mrs. Eddy's defense of herself against this charge of plagiarism is brilliant and conclusive. It is simply this: Dr. Quimby died in 1865, whereas her "first revelation" of Christian Science was in 1866! It is characteristic of the peculiar modes of reasoning which distinguish Mrs. Eddy from all who have written books or founded great religious systems, that in this instance she relies triumphantly upon the very fact which clear-headed people are compelled to consider most suspicious—that she did not receive this revelation until Dr. Quimby was under ground. Imagine Joseph Smith, Jr., defending himself against the charge that Rev. Solomon Spaulding wrote the Book of Mormon by saying he did not "discover" that book till long after Spaulding was dead!

Mrs. Eddy has not been allowed to play her role of prophetess and reformer without rivals. Several

---

what all unprejudiced readers are compelled to regard conclusive and overwhelming testimony to show that Mrs. Eddy derived the essential points of her theory, and even the term "Christian Science," from Dr. Quimby. Among other items contributed by Mrs. Woodbury is a poem by Mrs. Eddy, entitled "Lines on the Death of Dr. P. P. Quimby, who healed with the Truth that Christ taught," etc., which concludes as follows:

> "Heaven but the happiness of that calm soul,
> Growing in stature to the throne of God.
> *Rest should reward him who hath made us whole,*
> *Seeking, though tremblers, where his footsteps trod.*"

Mrs. Eddy has since intimated that *if* she wrote this poem it must have been under the malign influence of Dr. Quimby's departed spirit! Her head, she says in the *Christian Science Journal* of June, 1887, must have been "turned by animal magnetism and will-power."

mutually antagonistic schools of mental healing have been developed, and the feelings engendered by these rivalries combine the intensity of the *odium theologicum* with that of the *odium medicum*. Forgetting, possibly, the old proverb that those who live in glass houses should not throw stones, Mrs. Eddy does not hesitate to hurl the accusation of plagiarism against all and singular of her rivals. "Some silly publications," she remarks, with her wonted modesty and gentleness, "whose only correct or salient points are borrowed, without credit, from *Science and Health* would set the world right on Metaphysical Healing, like children thrumming a piano and pretending to teach music or criticise Mozart."

Christian Science began in pious fraud and shameless pretense. Into what it grew, I propose to show in the following chapters.

III.

A MIRACULOUS BOOK.

Mrs. Eddy's great work, *Science and Health,* deserves to be counted among the curiosities of nineteenth century literature. Giving the results of her ripest thought and experience, and containing, as she would have us believe, a revelation of truth, which is the "gospel to this age,"[1] it is unique both in matter and style.

In this volume Mrs. Eddy essays to discuss and decide all the great questions that concern the origin, duty, and fate of humanity. The sublime egoism of the whole performance is but faintly indicated by a quotation which one must needs observe on the fly-leaf as he opens the volume:

> I, I, I, I itself, I,
> The inside and outside, the what and the why,
> The when and the where, the low and the high,
> All I, I, I, I itself, I.

Scarcely for a moment from the time when the author, "leaning on the sustaining Infinite," emerges to the dear reader's view in her preface till he finishes the last page, in which, with wondrous humility for an "Immortal" so richly endowed and so marvelously favored, she concludes her "feeble revelation," is he permitted to lose sight of her very original and interesting personality. "Verily, I say unto you," is her

[1] *Science and Health,* Preface.

only "oath for confirmation." She is her own highest authority, and declares that the revelation which she announces to the world was vouchsafed to none but herself.

Science and Health is a book of endless repetitions. The author's perpetual iterations are bewildering and wearisome. With many an eccentric curve, and many a perilous leap, and many a startling flight through thinnest ether, she rides her winged Pegasus round the whole universe; but after her first flight she returns from every new excursion only to tell us something she has already told. Never for a single instant does her reasoning proceed on a straight line. In fact, the straight line is a symbol, in her system, of the error she hates, "the finite, which has both beginning and end," "the belief in a self-existent and temporary material existence." Having such a prejudice against straight lines, it is, perhaps, natural that she should indulge in circular demonstrations. Her method is the absence of all methods. Her definitions do not define. Her syllogism invariably expresses its conclusion in its premise. One may open the volume at random and read in either direction without being able to discover any material difference either in the style of the argument or the sequence of the author's thoughts.

Her use of common English words is often such as to puzzle the reader. Assuming as the basic principle of her thinking a theory which denies the evidence of our five senses and the testimony of our reason, and yet compelled to clothe her vague conceptions in the language of ordinary experience, she must of necessity use many words in an accommodated sense. But words refuse to be thus always emptied of their origi-

nal contents and made the vehicles of foreign ideas, and the result is confusion than which imagination can conceive none worse confounded. But, nevertheless, she seems blissfully unconscious of the havoc she makes of the proprieties of English speech. "No pent-up Utica contracts her powers." Spurning all conventional restraints, both in thought and expression,—pouring "the new wine of the Spirit into the old bottles of the letter," [1] heedless of the bursting which must inevitably ensue, entailing the loss of both wine and bottles,—setting at defiance the laws of logic and the laws of language,—she essays to unfold a new system of medicine, a new philosophy, and a new theology.

Nor can she be accused of yielding to any excessive timidity or modesty in her supreme effort. Engaged in a higher and holier cause, she emulates the courage of the old Abolitionists. With heroic sense of the danger she incurs, and of the tremendous difficulties she must overcome, she addresses herself to the "task of the sturdy pioneer," and proceeds laboriously to "hew the tall oak and cut the rough granite"; and it may be safely affirmed that from the beginning of the world until now such hewing, sawing, twisting, dividing asunder, and refashioning of things in the world of thought has not been witnessed. Impelled to open her treasures, she exhibits to our wondering view a new pearl of great price, and having risen high above all capability of displeasure at our unbelief, she commits her discovery, with Miltonic assurance of its high destiny, to "honest seekers for Truth in this and every age." [2]

---

[1] *Science and Health*, p. 8. [2] *Ibid.*, Preface.

Science and Health is a mixture of oracular dogmatism, of feeble and inconsequential argument, crude theory, hackneyed platitudes, adroit misrepresentations of orthodox teaching, fallacious reasoning, stupid and ignorant perversions of Scripture, borrowed heathenism, and withal of multitudinous absurdities. Its author's statements abound in self-contradictions. Facts which she denies in her theology she is compelled to admit in her ethics. Professing exceeding faith in the Scriptures as the "chart of life," she nevertheless seeks to substitute for them another chart, woven out of her own fancies, and marked with the eccentric lines of her own ill-regulated thought. Announcing her creed by a significant and absurd reference as the "leaven which A WOMAN took and hid in three measures of meal," she illustrates on every page the poet's remark about feminine thinking,—

> "A woman's reason is a woman's reason,—
> I think him so, because I think him so"—

a remark abundantly justified by the reasoning of some women, and particularly by the reasoning of such philosophers and theologians as Mrs. Eddy and a few others.

I have intimated that this new prophetess betrays gross ignorance. It would be tedious, even if it were necessary, to cull out of her pages the multiplied instances of incorrect grammar, of misused words, of faulty rhetoric, of stupid misconception, of irrelevant remark, and of unconscious blundering with which the book abounds.[1] Every page bears evidence that the

[1] Two amusing instances of the ignorance of "Mother Mary" are cited by Mrs. Woodbury in the *Arena* for May,

writer is not only a woman of deficient education, but of meager and eccentric intellect. Her style shows not an element of grace. Her occasional efforts at fine writing are supremely ludicrous, while her attempts to lug into her discussion every fact which can possibly be twisted into a seeming confirmation of her theory, are at once palpable and absurd. She claims to have "discovered" a new system of Metaphysics, and yet in her discussions she exhibits ignorance of the very rudiments of mental philosophy. She pretends to have elaborated a science which will take the place of so-called "natural science," and yet she makes it plain that she is profoundly ignorant of the facts which it has been the function of natural science to classify and to explain. Thus, for instance, she asserts that the propagation of bees, moths and butterflies takes place "without the customary presence of male companions!" And having stated as a fact what is not a fact, she uses this as an argument to prove her theory that the procreation of the human species is mental, and not physical!—*Science and Health,* p. 541. She knows little of the English language, and less of Hebrew, Greek and Latin; but in her disjointed arguments she does not hesitate to quote and translate, with all the assurance of the most

1899. On page 12 of *Science and Health,* edition of 1886, Mrs. Eddy speaks of her opposition to gnosticism, but later it appeared that she meant agnosticism. Again, in the summer of 1898 certain newspapers ridiculed her copyrighted statement that the word Pantheism was derived from the sylvan god, Pan. She took pains to correct her error, when informed of it by one outside the ranks, *at the very time the "Christian Science Journal" was laboring to support her ignorance in the premises!*

profound scholar, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and even Icelandic! She challenges the whole Christian world to controversy; and yet she does not understand the first principles of logic, and is blind to the innumerable fallacies of her own reasoning.

And yet this book, which is plainly the product of an untrained and ill-furnished mind, claims more than ever book claimed since the world began. It is not only a new gospel, but a "final revelation,"—the very last that shall ever illuminate the darkness of human ignorance and woe. It proffers a "Key to the Scriptures," without which the manifold wealth of Revelation must forever remain hidden from our eyes, and contains truth sufficient to deliver the entire race for all time from all the ills that flesh is heir to.

As a matter of course, such a book must needs possess plenary inspiration. And Mrs. Eddy is equal to the emergency. "No human tongue or pen," she declares, "taught me the science contained in *Science and Health,* and neither tongue nor pen can overthrow it." "Genuine Christian Scientists," says the *Christian Science Journal* of February, 1891, "are those who adhere to *Science and Health* with Key to the Scriptures to *regulate their daily life.*" "It surely is God's word," writes a correspondent in the same periodical—"his best gift to fallen man; our rich inheritance, our salvation from sin, sickness and death." Says still another, "What a wonderful help the quarterly Bible lessons are! They seem to be the link connecting *Science and Health* and the Bible, uniting them as one—the word of God."

Not only is this book alleged to be in all points equal to the Bible in respect of inspiration and authority, but even superior. The following, written

by one of Mrs. Eddy's followers, and published in a tract protected by her copyright, is presumed to have been printed with her full approbation: *"Science and Health* does what Jesus did not, because humanity was not ready for it—what the apostles could not," etc.—*Christian Science Series,* No. 6, p. 3. And accordingly it is even presented as a substitute for our glorious Lord, whose name was called "Emmanuel, which is, being interpreted, God with us." Says one of its advocates, "*Science and Health* is 'God with us.'" It is, says still another, "the true Logos," and likewise the "Comforter, which leadeth into all truth." This new creed, and not the Divine Man, Christ Jesus, is the "Good Shepherd," who feeds and protects the flock of the redeemed, and "its substance is the bread of life, which feeds the multitudes."[1]

It is not surprising, therefore, in view of her claim to a degree of inspiration and authority which she does not accord to the Bible itself, that Mrs. Eddy goes so far as to proclaim herself a new infallibility, possessing the keys of the heavenly kingdom. This she does, blowing her own trumpet with no uncertain sound; and her brazen blare is echoed throughout the camp of her followers. "We must forsake the foundations of material systems, however time-honored," says this new mistress of mankind, "if we would gain the Christ as our only Saviour."—*Science and Health,* p. 221. "At the present stage of human experience the only way to gain this consciousness [*i. e.*, of being the child of God] can be found through competent instruction in Christian Science,

[1] *Christian Science Journal,* February, 1891.

by which [*sic*] can be learned how to conform our daily walks to the footprints of Jesus' pathway."—*Christian Science Series,* No. 12, p. 3. "Those who live the life of science" are "children of Good," or God (*Christian Science Series,* No. 12, p. 7), and they only are true "immortals," while all who reject the claims of the new revelation are dead in trespasses and in sins.—*Science and Health,* p. 212. "As Christian Scientists," said Mrs. Woodbury before her eyes were opened, "we have taken a stand before the world—the avowed exponents of a religion which claims to set forth the only way into the kingdom of heaven. . . . Every student of our college knows beyond all doubt that Christian Science is the narrow way that leads to eternal life."—*Christian Science Voices,* p. 63.

Such claims are enough, surely, to startle the world; but we have not yet fully exhibited the boundless presumption of our author, nor the infinite credulity of her dupes. More marvelous than its claim to plenary inspiration and more than Messianic authority, is the claim asserted for Mrs. Eddy's book as a remedy for human ills. "The perusal of the author's publications heals sickness constantly," Mrs. Eddy calmly informs us (*Science and Health,* p. 443); and *Science and Health* is her great medicine chest. It is a truly miraculous volume, a physician and Saviour in paper and ink, healing all manner of sickness and all degrees of depravity in those who read it, accomplishing the speedy redemption both of soul and body. It has been its author's aim to make it the "Æsculapius of Mind" (p. 45), and she thinks she has succeeded in her effort. It possesses "sanative leafage" (p. 443), and in those who read it with

proper faith it "changes the secretions, expels humors, dissolves tumors, relaxes rigid muscles, and restores carious bones to soundness." Its author reports that, in her own "demonstrations," and solely by the magic truth which her book sets forth, she has seen shortened limbs elongated, cicatrized joints made supple, the lost substance of lungs restored, and—more wonderful still!—cancer that "had eaten its way to the jugular vein" cured instantly, and even the dying revived in a moment! "A high attenuation of truth"—the only form in which, as the reader will be led to suspect, Mrs. Eddy ever administers that potent remedy—is a sovereign specific for boils, and is equally efficacious for small-pox or diphtheria.—*Unity of Good,* pp. 8, 9; *Science and Health,* pp. 47, 55, 56, 73, 89, 423.

True, these wonderful results do not always follow at once upon the perusal of this magical book. Sometimes, indeed, the first symptoms of the invalid, as he drinks at this fountain, are disagreeable. His disease may even seem to be aggravated. This, however, need not discourage him. He is assured by his infallible guide that the very aggravation of his trouble is a hopeful sign—only, in fact, the "chemicalization" or mental ferment caused by the digestion of the truth,—a proof, indeed, of approaching recovery; and that if he will continue to read—and, of course, to believe—he will find himself well in due time.—p. 419.

The book likewise imparts to all who read it its own wonderful power! Mrs. Eddy declares that when her mind is filled with these precious principles the very "aroma" of her thought,[1] like the hem of the

[1] *Rudiments and Rules,* p. 17.

Master's garment, has power to heal; and we may presume that her volume is well perfumed with this miraculous essence. Nor is there any unwillingness on the part of her adherents to admit the justice of this claim. They count her a Saviour, and affirm, with Mrs. Woodbury, that "no one can remain long within the pure realm of her thought, yet care to continue in sin."—*Christian Science Voices,* p. 129. Not only sinless perfection, but prophetic inspiration and foresight, ability to read the minds of others, even miracle-working power, are guaranteed by Mrs. Eddy to all who faithfully obey her commands, and dutifully accept her teachings! They may "reach the range of fetterless mind," be able to "foresee and foretell events," "be divinely inspired," and learn to "read mortal mind more accurately than the astronomer can read the stars or calculate an eclipse."—*Science and Health,* p. 250. Never did politician seeking votes make more reckless promises than this new prophetess has made in commending her own literary wares. She holds out to all the multitudes, whom she prophesies will yet follow her footsteps, the hope not only of attaining to the exalted heights to which she has attained in the healing and redemptive arts, but even of surpassing her by the splendor of their achievements. The extinction of sin and of evil in this world depends, she would have them believe, not upon any divine permission or decree, but solely upon the efforts of those devoted Christian Scientists who, like herself, are working unselfishly for the world's redemption. She, indeed, is driven, as we shall see, to confess the impotency of her science to deal properly with broken bones; she does not pretend to have raised any who were dead, nor does she

dare to hope that she herself will, like Elijah, escape from death; yet nevertheless she predicts a time when her followers will demonstrate over every form of evil, "hold crime in check," and "master sin, sickness and death."—*Science and Health,* pp. 262, 426.

That such pretensions have gained credence to any considerable extent in the noon-day glare of our nineteenth century Christian civilization, is a sad commentary on the gullibility of mankind. How these pretensions tend to overthrow the very foundations of the Christian faith, and to enthrone stark heathenism in the place of Christian truth, will appear in the further progress of our discussion.

IV.

A NEW MARIOLATRY.

In Boston there is a magnificent church dedicated, not to Almighty God, but to Mrs. Mary Baker Glover Eddy, the alleged "discoverer" and "founder" of "Christian Science." The society under whose auspices the stately pile—which is said to have cost a quarter of a million dollars—was built, was established by Mrs. Eddy, who was its first, and continued to be for some years, its only pastor. A striking feature of the services in this church, which are said to be always attended by immense crowds, is that a seat is reserved perpetually for Mrs. Eddy, to whom the whole sect gives the title of "mother." This vacant pew reminds her followers that, though absent in body, she is still present by virtue of her omnipresent thought, and serves to emphasize the fact of her spiritual authority and oversight among them. On the wall behind the pulpit are pictures of two books side by side—the Bible and *Science and Health* —which these "scientific" Christians consider equal in authority and inspiration.

There is also in this church a "circular apartment with stained glass windows, which symbolize, as does everything else in the building, some thought connected with religion." This room, built and furnished for Mrs. Eddy's exclusive use, was the offering of some four thousand children of the sect, and is said to be one of the most expensive private rooms

in the city. It is, in fact, a sort of shrine to a human divinity.[1]

The deference paid by Christian Scientists to Mrs. Eddy is, indeed, extraordinary. She is accorded all the rights of a prophet and an apostle. More than that, she is, says Horatio W. Dresser, in the *Arena,* "compared to Christ, whose face is made to resemble hers in a picture where the two stand side by side." She is accredited with having achieved more than

[1] A marble archway opposite the central door of the church leads to this room. The archway is draped with dark velvet hangings, and on either side stand white pots holding ornamental palms. The vestibule is lighted from above, the light falling on the door and revealing over it a white marble tablet upon which, in gold, is inscribed the word "Love." The room is furnished with beautifully carved white mahogany, and the chairs are upholstered in white satin and gold. The couch is filled with eider-down. A writing-desk of costly material and exquisite workmanship has in its stationery case, for Mrs. Eddy's use whenever she may choose to occupy the apartment, paper with the words, "Mother's Room" stamped upon it in gold. An elegant eider-down rug ornaments the floor. An exquisite cabinet holds a complete edition of Mrs. Eddy's works, bound in the prevailing white and gold. The mantel and table are of Mexican onyx, and on the former rest a magnificent French clock, candelabra, and imported vases. An artistically draped picture shows the chair in which Mrs. Eddy sat when composing her precious book, and the table on which she wrote, with *scattered sheets* of MSS. lying on the table and the floor—the latter, it must be admitted, being a most appropriate indication of the chaotic character of Mrs. Eddy's inspired compositions. A door on one side opens into an elegantly furnished bed-room, while on the other side is a bath-room done in African marble, with pipes and faucets heavily plated with gold.—*Vide* Charleston (S. C.) *Sunday News,* Aug. 15, 1897.

Jesus did, and more than his apostles could achieve. Her utterances are accepted as divinely inspired. Her word is law to thousands. She occupies, in the opinion of her followers, the place of Saviour to all in this generation. "The key to happiness is in her hands," said Mrs. Josephine Curtis Woodbury in the days when she blindly followed Mrs. Eddy's guidance, "and she is waiting until the slumbering world awakes to seek it before she can present it."

Of the nature of the homage paid her we can gather some idea from Mrs. Woodbury's account of her appearance before the National Association of Christian Scientists in Chicago in 1888, if we bear in mind that as the number of her disciples has increased and the fame of her holy life and astounding miracles has gone abroad, the worship which she receives has become more popular and pronounced. At Chicago, in the year aforesaid, eight hundred of Mrs. Eddy's followers came together, acknowledging "one leader, one purpose, one cause." Memorable scenes followed her address on that occasion. Said Mrs. Woodbury, in the *Christian Science Journal:*

> The people were in the presence of the woman whose book had healed them, and they knew it. They came in crowds to her side, begging for one hand-clasp, one look, one memorial from her whose name was a power and a sacred thing in their homes. Those whom she had never seen before—invalids benefited by her book, *Science and Health*—each attempted to tell her the wonderful story. A mother who failed to get near held aloft her babe, that the little one might behold her helper. Others touched the dress of their benefactor, not so much as asking for more. An aged woman, trembling with palsy, lifted her shaking hands at Mrs. Eddy's feet, crying, "Help! Help!" and the cry was answered. Many such people were known to go away

healed. Strong men turned away to hide their tears as the people thronged about her with blessings and thanks . . . Meekly and almost silently she received all this homage from the multitude. . . The thoughts of those present went back in memory to scenes of eighteen hundred years ago, when through Jesus was manifested the healing power.

The parallel between this account of the thronging of Mrs. Eddy and the gospel story of the thronging of Jesus is palpably intentional, and the writer does not surprise us by her remark upon the resemblances between the two scenes. Her expressed conviction that in Mrs. Eddy is manifested the same healing power that was manifested in Jesus, is only one of many evidences that this sect regards the prophetess of Tilton as a new Theophany.

The worship accorded to Mary the Virgin by the intelligent Romanist amounts to little more than that accorded by Christian Scientists to their holy mother, if, indeed, it can be justly considered as great. The Romanist does not pretend that to Mary he is to look for the words of eternal life, whereas Mrs. Eddy is to her followers the accredited oracle of God, without whose instructions they have no way of attaining happiness or salvation. Catholics are solicitous of Mary's favor, and attribute marvelous efficacy to her intercessions with her Divine Son, to whom, after all, they look for their redemption; but they do not invest her with any divine attributes. They do not believe her to be an incarnation of God, nor does she in their system take the place of the Saviour as their teacher and exemplar. They place her, it is true, between the sinner and his Saviour, but they do not pretend that she can save any soul without the grace of Jesus. But Christian Scientists deny, as we shall

see in a subsequent chapter, the whole scheme of salvation by grace, and claim for Mrs. Eddy, as she has claimed for herself, that her teaching, and it alone, is the "bread of life," and that salvation is impossible to all who do not accept her theories and follow her example. Only by treading in the path of Christian Science can we learn how to follow Christ. The Christian Scientist, as Mrs. Woodbury has shown, deems it a privilege if he may but touch the hem of Mrs. Eddy's garment; counts her a healer possessed of the same power that Christ had, and acknowledges her book and herself to be "the voice of Truth," or God, "to this generation." It is the ambition of all true Scientists to "come closer to that wonderful life which is being lived among them for their example and hope";[1] and at least one speaker in the Christian Science Church of Boston is known to have declared her conviction that Mrs. Eddy is now to be considered "the Word made flesh."[2] It is said that many of Mrs. Eddy's followers believe that she will never die. "The facts of Mary Eddy" show that she is the willing recipient of an homage just as genuine, if not as elaborate, as that paid by Romanists to the Blessed Virgin.

Perhaps the following rhapsody by Mrs. Woodbury may be considered a sample of Christian Science prayer to the "dearest mother" of this new church of Christ:

Oh! faithful one! We can come into a true conception of thee, sharing thy love and thy power, only when we pattern our ways after thine, heeding thy precious words of

[1] *Christian Science Voices,* p. 188.
[2] *War in Heaven,* p. 57.

warning and wisdom so freely given. Thou callest us from the worship of idols to close communion with the true and perfect Father, and biddest us *sup with thee* at the table spread with the gifts of daily food; but we are loath to listen until sharp struggles turn us, worn and weary, from the vanity of our ways. We test the purity and endurance of thy love and pity by ingratitude and disdain. We are cold and indifferent to thy pleadings, often turning a deaf ear to thy watchful, tender prayers; yet thou dost ever wait and watch and pray, yearning over us thy children with that exquisite mother-love which knows no change nor abatement, repaying injustice and falsehood with blessing and healing.

Oh! patient Mother! We see thee dearer as we grow older in truth. We learn that this book which thou hast bequeathed to us is the outgrowth and epitome of thy life. We are willing to follow as thou leadest, looking away from the personal sense of thee, as *thou revealest to us the mother-heart of God!—Christian Science Voices,* pp. 75-6.

How closely this outburst of devotion follows the thought of the Christian as he bows before the Divine Son, whose example he would fain imitate, and through whom he holds fellowship with the Divine Father, will be apparent to any one who will study its phrases a moment. It is a rhapsody embodying essential prayer. Most plainly does it recognize in Mrs. Eddy's life and character a new Theophany, and beseech her to pardon the sin of not having duly heeded her words of instruction. As to the spirit in which Mrs. Eddy's instructions have been received by her disciples, the following, from the same authority, is doubtless a fair indication:

In the sacred hours of the class-room, illumined with the supernal light of revelation, did we not bare our feet, like Moses before the bush burning with holy fire? When self-

hood was hushed we saw the temple veil rent asunder; neither was Gehenna hidden from our astonished gaze. Our Leader opened the door, that we might, like the Revelator, have glimpses of the awfulness latent in mortal mind. Upon our hearts rested a sacrament of extreme unction, impelling us forth . . . counting not the cost of crucifixion, looking not backward upon Gomorrah, pressing anew the bleeding footprints of our past Master and our present Mother.—*War in Heaven,* pp. 27-8.

Our Lord is here spoken of as occupying a subordinate position—a *past Master!* It is only just, however, to Mrs. Woodbury, and at the same time an enhancement of the value of her testimony, to add that since she wrote her two volumes, *Christian Science Voices* and *War in Heaven,* she has recanted her Christian Scientist profession. In a letter written to me December 31, 1898, she speaks regretfully of the "blind adoring faith" and the "idolatrous love" which she formerly cherished toward Mrs. Eddy, and to the enormity of which she has but recently awakened. Mrs. Woodbury has been known for a number of years as a poet of no mean ability, a very successful teacher of Christian Science, and also a healer of considerable reputation. She was at one time acting editor of the *Christian Science Journal,* and was also chairman of the Christian Scientist Association's Publishing Committee. Until within the past year (1898) she was an earnest advocate of Christian Science doctrines, and her success as healer and teacher has at times brought her an income of several thousands annually. She was at last enabled to realize her folly in yielding so completely to the influence of Mrs. Eddy, and according such unquestioning faith to her teachings. In the *Boston Herald* in December last

she published a sharp satire, entitled "Americanitis," of which the following are the concluding verses:

Fie, Dame Christian Science!
We place no reliance
On all your high-sounding stock-phrases and cant!
Your creed a disease is
Like appendicitis,—
The poison and rot of ineffable rant.

What's the logical sequence
Of miracle frequence,
Except to inflate us with glamour and pelf?
Is the Dame that seemed august
A doll stuffed with sawdust,
And must we believe that the doll stuffed herself?

To call Mrs. Eddy's doctrine the "poison and rot of ineffable rant" after years of labor in trying to convert the world to faith in it as the latest revelation of Divine truth, shows a complete somersault; and to declare that the chief effect of the success, or "miracle frequence," of Christian Science healers is to "inflate them with glamour and pelf," is to draw a sharp indictment. And, inasmuch as we behold in "Dame Christian Science" no less a personage than Mrs. Eddy, who has assuredly seemed a most "august" dame to her deluded worshippers, the epithet, "a doll stuffed with saw-dust," affords a striking contrast with some expressions in the prayer just now quoted, and indicates a very complete awakening to the baseless character of Mrs. Eddy's claims, and the infamy of the imposture which she has perpetrated.

But Mrs. Woodbury's recantation will have little effect on those who have yielded themselves completely to Mrs. Eddy, receiving her as Mrs. Woodbury once did, as a "Mental Messiah," and finding

themselves relieved of their ailments, as they imagine, by the "sanative leafage" of her miraculous book, and the "aroma" of her more miraculous thought. The last gathering at Concord, New Hampshire, of Christian Scientists, who came from far to pay "homage" to Mrs. Eddy, brought together a concourse of more than two thousand souls. Of this gathering the Peoria (Ill.) *Journal* remarked:

The Christian Scientists of the country had a grand rally at Concord, Mass.,[1] July 4, and "paid homage," whatever that may mean, to the foundress of their sect. Mrs. Eddy made the usual address, to the effect that she had "banished sin, suffering and death" from the world. And one of her admirers present has written to the secular papers expressing the sorrow many of them felt when recognizing that they had probably seen her for the last time. That is better than anything in Mark Twain. There is no humorist equal to your unconscious humorist. The mental make-up of a hearer who pays "homage" to a woman because she has "banished death," and who is bowed in sorrow when the thought occurs to him how soon the speaker herself must die, is past finding out. David said that all men are "fearfully and wonderfully made," but some men are more wonderfully put together than others.

This homage has resulted, it seems, in bringing upon Mrs. Eddy a flood of inquiries as to her pretensions. As far back as 1895 it had brought her an inquiry by telegraph, to which she replied in the New York *World,* February 1, 1895, as follows:

A despatch is given to me, calling for an interview, to answer for myself, Am I the second Christ?

Even the question shocks me. What I am is for God to de-

[1] An error. It should have been N. H.

clare in his infinite mercy. As it is, I claim nothing more than what I am, the discoverer and founder of Christian Science and the blessing it has been to mankind which eternity unfolds.

My books and teachings maintain but one conclusion and statement of the Christ and the deification of mortals.

Christ is individual, and one with God, in the sense of divine Principle and its compound divine idea.

There never was, is not now, and never can be, but one God, one Christ, one Jesus of Nazareth. Whosoever in any age expresses most of the spirit of Truth and Love, the Principle of God's idea, has most of the spirit of Christ, of that Mind which was in Christ Jesus.

If Christian Scientists find in my writings, teachings and example a greater degree of this spirit than in others, they can justly declare it. But to think and speak of me in any manner as a Christ is sacrilegious. Such a statement would not only be false, but the absolute antipode of Christian Science, and would savor more of heathenism than of my doctrines. MARY BAKER EDDY.

"In the name of the God whom she serves," says the *Christian Science Sentinel* of February 16, 1899, commenting on this telegram, "and of the humanity she desires to serve, and to the best of her ability is serving in so large a measure that untold thousands are calling her blessed, should she be stoned and maligned?" Here is testimony from an unimpeachable source. The *Christian Science Sentinel* affirms that "untold thousands are calling her blessed," quoting the very passage to which Romanists appeal for justification in worshipping the Blessed Virgin! But Mrs. Eddy's disclaimer, when examined in connection with her teachings, and when its own terms are analyzed, turns out to be quite as much an affirmation as a denial of the very point at issue. We ob-

serve in this manifesto, which is polished after the similitude of Mrs. Eddy's choicest rhetoric,—

1. That Mrs. Eddy is delightfully uncertain as to who and what she is. Evidently she thinks herself no common mortal. The "discoverer and founder of Christian Science and the blessing it has been to mankind which eternity unfolds" may well be excused for being uncertain as to the precise rank she occupies among the most august of God's "creatures, or ideas."

2. That any claim on her part to be a Christ is excluded by her definition of the term. Christ, she says, is individual—which is to say, not personal. She prefers to use the term *individual* instead of *personal,* as we shall see when we come to examine her teachings in detail, both when speaking of God and man. She is a "human personality," but Christ is, in her opinion, neither a human nor a divine personality. He is the "compound idea" of God, while Mrs. Eddy, though a "spiritual idea," mysterious and incomprehensible, both to herself and others, is not precisely *that* "compound idea."

3. That, while denying that she is Jesus, or the Christ, or even a Christ, for these obvious reasons, she does not object to the homage bestowed upon her. She admits practically that she *may* be "the chief among ten thousand, and the one altogether lovely," the highest and most favored of mortals. If, in the estimation of her followers, she expresses "most of the spirit of Truth and Love, the Principle of God's idea," which Principle, as we shall see, is God himself, she may be justly declared to have "most of the spirit of Christ, of that Mind which was in Christ Jesus." This statement concedes the very point in dispute. She admits in terms that she considers herself an expression or manifestation of God, since she

holds that the only mind in the universe is God, and that she *may* be the highest "expression" of God. That she is considered a true Theophany, and is worshipped as such, whether in orthodox forms or not, is beyond question; and her own words show that she does not reject this worship, even should it go so far as to acknowledge that in her, as in Jesus, dwells "the fullness of the Godhead."

As bearing upon this point, and also upon the mooted question whether Mrs. Eddy is as original in her alleged revelation as she claims to be, we may add the following, which is quoted from her in the same periodical:

> In his (Dr. Quimby's) conversations with me, and in his scribblings, the word science was not used at all till one day I declared to him that back of his magnetic treatment and manipulation of patients there was a science, and it was the Science of Mind, that had nothing to do with matter, electricity, or physics. After this I noticed that he used that word, as well as other terms which I employed, which seemed at first new to him. He even acknowledged this himself, and startled me one day by saying what I cannot forget. It was this: "I see now what you mean, and I see that I am John, and that you are Jesus." At that date I was a staunch orthodox, and my theological belief was offended by his saying, and I entered a demurrer which rebuked him. But afterwards I concluded that he only referred to the coming anew of Truth, which we both desired, for in some respects he was quite a seer, and understood what I said better than some others did—and for one so unlearned, he was a remarkable man.[1]

[1] There is a striking similarity between the origin of Christian Scientism and that of Shakerism. We have here Mrs. Eddy's statement that when she was brooding over the possibility of a second advent she was startled by Dr. Quimby's prophecy, "I am John the Baptist, and you are Jesus."

It is evident from this that, however much the "theological belief" of our "staunch orthodox" may have been offended by Dr. Quimby's blasphemous suggestion, her modesty was not. And *here is the evidence that not only did she learn much from Dr. Quimby,* but *talked with him about the science which she afterwards professed to discover.* Here, too, is the evidence, if her own statement is to be trusted, that in the early sixties she was already musing upon

Ann Lee, the founder of Shakerism, a native of Manchester, England, joined in 1758 a small religious body, "a remnant of the French Prophets," the leader of which was Jane Wardley, who was considered by her followers to be "the spirit of John the Baptist, operating in the female line." It was already a tenet of this body that the second advent of Christ was to be in the person of a woman, who was to be a spiritual Eve, the "first mother or spiritual parent in the line of the female." When Ann was "converted" and had become a leader, her gifts led the sect to consider her the new Christ for whose advent they were looking, and they forthwith recognized her as "Mother." Had she not promulgated a doctrine of celibacy it is quite probable that her new church would have flourished. As it is, there are now some eight or ten thousand Shakers in the world. Mrs. Eddy, while evidently favorable to celibacy, and prophesying a future millennium in which the race will be propagated mentally, without conjugal association, recommends matrimony for the present. Like Ann Lee, she is recognized by her followers as Mother, and as the manifestation of Christ to this generation. In her recent congratulatory message to the Atlanta Christian Scientist Church, read at the dedication of their meeting-house, she says, in her usual plain style, "The ponderous walls of your grand cathedral cannot prevent me from entering where the heart of a Southron has welcomed me." This, taken in connection with her *empty pew* in the "Mother Church," squints a little at omnipresence. Great is human credulity, even in this nineteenth century.

another advent of truth, and cherishing the idea that this advent of truth was to be realized through her ministry. She uses the capital T in writing truth, and this means that she is talking of a new Theophany, a second advent of Christ. For Truth, in her terminology, means Christ; and just as God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, so now does Mrs. Eddy claim to be considered a revealer of the Divine will and word to man, publishing the glad tidings of a more perfect salvation than any which has yet been proclaimed. She does not conceal the persuasion, which has never been kept secret from her followers,—a persuasion springing, it may be, from her own gratified vanity,—that Dr. Quimby was right, and that she is indeed *a Jesus* to this generation. A Jesus, that is, in the sense of being a Saviour; and inasmuch as "woman is the highest species of man," according to the revelation which she commands us to receive at her hands, she must needs be accounted superior to the Man of Nazareth. Says the Rev. Mr. Vosburg, in a lecture delivered under the auspices of the Christian Science Board of Lectureship, and reported in the New York *Mail and Express* of March 17, 1899:

> As Jesus revealed the fatherhood of God, she, our Mother in the faith, has revealed to us the motherhood of God, and has unveiled the transcendent beauty of Christliness. And for this we give her love. As Christians, could we do less?

Our Lord's dying cry was mistaken. He should not have said, "It is finished." His work was not finished until Mrs. Eddy, the anointed woman, came: a female Christ, anointed with the Spirit, that she might, in her own motherly character, reveal the divine motherhood and explain Christ himself!

V.

OBSTACLES REMOVED—THE BIBLE SET ASIDE AND ORTHODOXY REPUDIATED.

The eighth, ninth and tenth verses of Revelation x. are a puzzle to all commentators except to Mrs. Eddy and her children. They are confident that "the little book" which John was commanded to eat was nothing less than "Divine Science," which is now embodied in *Science and Health*. "Mortal," cries this new infallibility, "obey the heavenly evangel. Take up Divine Science. Read it [*i. e.*, as presented in her book] from beginning to end. Study it, ponder it. It will be indeed sweet at its first taste when it heals you; but murmur not over Truth, if you find its digestion bitter."—*Science and Health*, p. 551. And she proceeds to hint mysteriously that all who become her disciples must suffer persecution, "share the hemlock cup, and eat the bitter herbs," for thus did the Israelites at the Paschal meal prefigure "this perilous passage out of bondage into the El Dorado of faith and hope."

But sweet as this infallible Science is in the tasting, there is needed a certain preparation for those who are to partake of it as a daily passover. It is, as she admits, not easy to digest. It is not only sweet, but entirely too sweet, and liable to nauseate all who believe in the inspiration and authority of the Bible, as well as all who have ordinary respect for the cur-

rent theology of evangelical Christendom. The Bible warns us against those who shall add to its divine utterances, and it declares itself to contain "all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue." Its denunciations of false teachers are numerous and terrible; and its testimony that the gospel, as proclaimed by the prophets and apostles, is sufficient for the salvation of the world, is clear and emphatic. The gospel of our Lord Jesus, as it is presented in the New Testament, is a final revelation, and has been so understood by the church for nineteen Christian centuries. Nor is there among the chief sects of Evangelical Christendom any great divergence of views as to the teachings of the Scriptures bearing upon the main points of Christian doctrine. The orthodox mind is disposed to reject anything that is proposed as a substitute for, or an addition to, the "faith once delivered to the saints." Hence the Bible must be somehow set aside if the revolutionary teachings of this new gospel are to be accepted, notwithstanding the loud professions made by the new prophetess of her allegiance to the Scriptures as the "chart of life," and her pretense—incredible in itself, as will appear when we come to examine her doctrines, and unsupported by the evidence, as we have already seen—that the Bible was her "only text-book" in studying out the great system which she has managed to fabricate.

Those who consider themselves inspired cannot be expected to defer very much to the *dictum* of any Galilean fisherman or converted Pharisee; and a woman who is willing to be worshipped as the "Word made flesh" for this generation, need hardly be

counted upon to stand up for any word of Jesus, or any doctrine of Paul or Peter. Two things, therefore, must be accomplished in the preparation of all who are to accept Christian Science. They must be taught that the doctrine of inspiration, as held by Evangelical churches, is all stuff, and that orthodoxy is the synonym of ignorance and narrowness. Both efforts combine to prepare the mind of the docile "student" for the assimilation of Mrs. Eddy's "advanced thought."

The first step, then, must be to discredit the Bible. The following, from a writer in a Christian Science periodical, edited by one of Mrs. Eddy's most loyal pupils, may be considered as expressive of the view entertained by the school:

> The general disagreement as to what is sin is owing to the fact that no infallible standard for judging such matters has been found. The Hebrew and Christian Bible is not the standard for the race.—*Rostrum,* p. 51.

If Mrs. Eddy's book is the standard for the race, the Bible is not; so much, at least, is evident. But Mrs. Eddy says that the Scriptures are "very sacred." How sacred in the estimation of those who have eaten her "little book" we may learn from Rev. Frank E. Mason. "The Bible," says this distinguished advocate of Christian Science, "contains more aggregate truth than any other one production"; but "to suppose that it is especially divinely inspired is unreasonable. . . . The Bible is a consensus of spiritual ideas, in the same sense that *Mother Goose* is the consensus of nursery rhymes, or as *Puck* and *Judge* are the centralization of humor."—*Seed,* p. 44. This is very advanced thought. The infallible exponents of the so-

called "higher criticism" have been saying these years past that the inspiration of prophets and apostles is in no wise different in kind from that of Bacon or Shakespeare. Now comes the "scientific" Mr. Mason with the statement that Isaiah and Paul had no inspiration other than that vouchsafed for their purpose to *Puck* and *Mother Goose*. Verily, to use a significant remark of Mrs. Eddy, "the rays of infinite Truth, when gathered into the focus of ideas, bring light instantaneously; whereas a thousand years of unconcentrated beams—human beliefs, hypotheses, and vague conjectures—emit no effulgence!"—*Science and Health*, p. 498. This gleam of inspiration from Mr. Mason is startlingly brilliant; but here is another from the same shining source which is, if anything, still more concentrated:

> Remove the gospels, the epistles and the Psalms from the Bible and what have you left?—Jewish traditions, which may or may not be true, but which obviously contain alike truth and error, fact and fiction. Many portions of the Old Testament are but vague reminiscences of periods so remote as to defy investigation, and which depict but the dim recollections of ancient legends of doubtful repute. To declare it sacrilegious to question their divine authenticity, or to find more inspiration and help in the utterances of Emerson and Tennyson as preëminently God-inspired, is truly indicative of bigotry and narrowness.—*Seed*, p. 44.

This is radiance even more effulgent than that cast by the Drummond light of Dr. Briggs' beaming thought; it is, in fact, the full splendor of Briggsism, combined with the latest discovery that has been utilized to aid our vision of hidden things. It is fluoroscopic light giving forth *X-rays of candor*, making the whole bony frame-work of the writer's thought

visible, notwithstanding what Mrs. Eddy would term the "opacity" of our reason.

Mrs. Eddy does not dare to go so far in her assertions. She assails the translators of King James' version, and calls attention significantly to the fact that there are "thirty thousand various readings in the Old Testament and three hundred thousand in the New!" And yet, though she has almost intimated that the New Testament is unworthy of credence, she prefers it to the Old. "The spiritual import of the Word in its earliest articulations" is "smothered by the immediate context" oftentimes; "whereas the New Testament narratives are clearer and come nearer to the heart."—*Science and Health,* p. 495. Again, "the Divine Science taught in the original language of the Bible came through inspiration, and needs inspiration to be understood."—p. 215. Which is to say, none but those who, like herself, are inspired can by any means understand the holy Book. All others are as "blind leading the blind." She goes so far even as to hint that the testimony of apostles and prophets is unsatisfactory, and their understanding of truth unreliable. From the fact that inspiration is required to understand the "original language" of the Bible there has resulted "the misapprehension of its spiritual meaning, and the misinterpretation of the Word, in some instances, by uninspired writers who were *only writing down what an inspired teacher had said.*" By this cunning insinuation, so indefinite that to the unwary it may seem most reasonable, she brushes aside the whole New Testament as without authority, except as interpreted by herself. As to the Old Testament, she is driven, as we shall see in our examination of her

teachings as to the origin and moral status of man, to adopt the absurd documentary hypothesis of the "higher critics," and otherwise to make the narrative entirely meaningless to the uninitiated reader.

It is to be noted also that nowhere has Mrs. Eddy defined inspiration. She makes quite orthodox statements in all she says as to the sacredness of the Scriptures, and even goes so far as to say that it is the "chart of Life, to mark the healing currents and buoys of Truth."—*Science and Health,* p. 329. But this divine revelation, she would have us believe, is locked forever to our understandings unless we use the "Key to the Scriptures" which she alone offers; and it is only Christian Science, of which she is the living compendium, which can be relied upon to "separate error from truth, and breathe through the sacred pages the spiritual sense of Life, Substance and Intelligence."—*Ibid.*, page 540. Thus has she taught unequivocally that the text of Scripture, partly through the mistakes of its uninspired writers, and partly through the mistakes of translators, is meaningless unless interpreted by her "Key." Explicitly she denies inspiration to all but those who were originally the mouth-pieces of Jehovah, and affirms that the original revelation has come down to us through such fallible media as to be entirely worthless, unless we have sufficient inspiration ourselves to separate the chaff from the wheat; or else, in our bewilderment, are permitted to turn to one like herself, who is able to guide us into all truth.

It is evident that in his bold denials of the inspiration of the Bible Mr. Mason and his correspondent from whom we quoted have but followed loyally in the path which Mrs. Eddy had marked out. She

suggested and hinted her opinion as to the worthlessness of the Bible as a standard for the race, and they have boldly avowed it.

Having set aside the Bible, these apostles of "scientific" religion proceed to do all in their power to discredit and undermine the whole fabric of Evangelical Christianity. Their evil animus toward all Christian churches is plainly seen on almost every page of their literature. Mrs. Eddy's writings teem with sly thrusts at the faith of the Christian world. "We soil our garments with conservatism," she sweetly informs us, "and afterwards must wash them clean."—*Science and Health,* p. 449. Reliance upon mere human authority has, in her opinion, vitiated all popular religious systems, but her new revelation is a "truly Divine Science, which eschews man-made systems."—*Ibid.,* p. 6. Christianity, as taught by the churches, "stands before the black-board and prays the *principle* of mathematics to work out the problem" (*Ibid.,* p. 308); but not so her infallible doctrine, since "between Christian Science and all forms of superstition there is a great gulf fixed, as impassable as that between Dives and Lazarus!"—*Ibid.,* p. 249. "The first gleam" of the new light which came to her in the hour of her "sacred discovery" was sufficient to wean her away from her old faith.—*Ibid.,* p. 467. The Bible is not to be considered authoritative, since "the Jewish theology gave no hints of the unchanging Love of God," and Christian Science undertakes to supply the lacking revelation.—*Ibid.,* p. 347. Sin can never be vanquished until, "in place of creeds and professions, the divine Principle of Being is understood and demonstrated"; and Christian Science only can show how to achieve this blessed demonstration.

Christian demands have "so little inspiration to spur mankind to Christian effort," she thinks, "because men are assured that these commands were intended only for a particular moment and for a select number of followers" (p. 343); but she does not tell us what church teaches this peculiar idea of Christian duty. However, she proceeds to say that this teaching "is more pernicious than the old doctrine of foreordination—the election of a few to be saved, while the rest are damned."—*Ibid.* There is hope for the world, however, inasmuch as the "lethargy" produced by such "man-made doctrines" will soon be broken by this new creed, which is offered confidently to the "advanced thinker and devout Christian."—*Ibid.*, pp. 343 and 345.

This angelic woman, whose mission it is to introduce to the world "a higher and more practical Christianity," rivals, if she does not surpass, Ingersoll in her persistent caricatures of current Christian teaching. Her soul is sad, because the phrase, "'divine service' has come so generally to mean public worship instead of daily deeds."—p. 345. Orthodox prayer she denounces as prayer "to God as a corporeal being," and as hurtful and demoralizing in its tendency. —p. 319. "Calling on him to forgive our work badly done or left undone, implies the vain supposition," she affirms, "that we have nothing to do but to ask pardon, and that afterwards we shall be free to repeat the offense."—p. 311. The doctrine of a vicarious atonement, too, is one which she despises heartily. "Final deliverance from error," according to this new infallibility, "is neither reached through paths of flowers, nor by pinning one's faith to another's vicarious effort."—p. 327. Such a notion is, in her opinion, ab-

surd, since "whosoever believeth that wrath is righteous, or that divinity is appeased by human suffering, does not understand God."—*Ibid.* In common with many others who count themselves "advanced thinkers," she is unwilling to believe that Christ died for the ungodly. The doctrine of the Trinity is handled in terms even less respectful. To her "the theory of three persons in one God . . . suggests heathen Gods."—p. 152.

In keeping with her vicious assaults on the doctrines of Evangelical Christianity, of which more anon, is her attitude toward the Christian ministry. "Now that the gospel of healing is again preached by the wayside, does not the pulpit scorn the message?" —p. 360. Therefore it is that the bitterest vials of her wrath are poured out upon the devoted heads of "the clergy." Ruled out of the synagogue, she must needs have her revenge, and she wreaks it upon the parsons, now in contemptuous remark, and anon in rhapsodic prophecy. Here, for instance, is a dignified and delicate insinuation: "Is it not professional reputation and emolument, rather than the dignity of God's laws, which many leaders seek?"—p. 132. Here, again, is a polite sneer: "One of the forms of worship in Thibet is to carry a praying machine through the streets and stop at the doors to earn a penny by grinding out a prayer; whereas civilization pays for prayers by the clergy in lofty edifices. Is the difference very great, after all?"—p. 316. And here is scorn, blazing and scorching: "If the soft palm, upturned to a lordly salary, and architectural skill, making spire and dome tremulous with beauty, turn the poor and stranger from the gate, they also shut the door on progress. In vain do the manger and the cross tell their story to pride and fustian.

Sensuality palsies the right hand, and causes the left to let go its divine grasp."—p. 36. This, too, is equally contemptuous: "As in Jesus' days, tyranny and pride need to be whipped out of the temple, and humility and Divine Science welcomed in. The strong cords of scientific demonstration twisted by Jesus"—she is too modest, perhaps, to use her own name in this connection, but her meaning is plain—"are still needed to purge the temples of their vain traffic in worldly policy, and make them meet dwelling-places for Truth."—*Ibid.* Imitating him whom her followers term their "*past* Master," she, it seems, has armed herself with a scourge of small cords, and proposes to whip all orthodox preachers out of the temple, that she may teach undisturbed by their contrary clamors! And here is prophecy: "The powers of this world will fight, and command their sentinels not to let Truth pass the guard until it subscribes to their creeds and systems; but Science, heeding not the pointed bayonet, marches on."—p. 121.

In all this we recognize an echo of the Tempter's question, "Hath God said?" The only way in which Mrs. Eddy and her school can gain a hearing among professed Christians is to break down in some way their reverence for all commonly accepted interpretations of the Scriptures, and destroy their respect for the authorized ministry of the Church of Christ. What we have quoted is but a small part of the statements occurring on almost every page of her book and abounding in the literature inspired by it, in which this evil animus is manifest. She is well aware that if Christian Science is ever to be accepted by the world at large as a true version of the gospel of Christ, the clergy must be silenced, and the new structure must rise upon the ruins of the old.

PART II.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE AS A SYSTEM OF MENTAL HEALING.

VI.

A FOOLISH PHILOSOPHY AND ITS ABSURD CONSEQUENCES.

"THERE is nothing, either good or bad, but thinking makes it so." This quotation is found on the fly-leaf of Mrs. Eddy's miraculous volume; and is most appropriate, inasmuch as it sets forth her whole theory of medicine and her whole system of theology in a single sentence. The basis of her system is idealism, whether borrowed from Bishop Berkeley or from theosophical sources. Mrs. Eddy makes no reference to Bishop Berkeley in her *magnum opus,* and boldly denies that her system has anything in common with Theosophy. Some of her followers, however, have recognized the identity of their philosophy with Berkeley's. A writer in the *Rostrum* of March, 1894, gravely asserts that the feat of extracting sunshine from cucumbers, which the crank in *Gulliver* is trying to achieve, may yet prove possible; and the same sapient reasoner declares that "the most notable exponent of this [*i. e.,* our] philosophy was undoubtedly the keenly intuitive and spiritually developed Bishop Berkeley. . . . He boldly affirmed all true substance to be spirit, and all true causation to be comprised in the free activity of such spirit. . . . Nature, in its ultimate analysis, was but a conscious experience—the outward symbol of a divine universal intelligence."

It is wonderful how often Mrs. Eddy enunciates

this fundamental postulate of the idealistic philosophy, and with what labored steps, tracing the thought into all its ramifications, she seeks to make it the foundation of a two-fold system of theology and therapeutics. But she differs from Berkeley and all other idealists in that, while they denied the substantial existence of external nature, they did not undertake to construct a new scheme of human life that would ignore the conscious experience and accumulated knowledge of the race. Berkeley, for instance, was an enthusiast in regard to the virtues of tar water, and published a lengthy treatise on the subject. He and all his school, moreover, were content to eat, to drink, and to sleep; to take medicine when they were sick, and to rest when they were tired. Nor did it occur to any of them that such a manner of living was inconsistent with their philosophy. They did not confound the human with the Divine intelligence, nor conclude that because mind was the only true substance, and all else to be considered as ideas of which mind is conscious, therefore we are to ignore all material appearances as unreal. Nor did Berkeley and his school ever confound the facts of creation and of external nature with those imaginations which are the product of human intellect. But all this Mrs. Eddy does; and the result is a philosophy that is folly, a theology that is heathenism, and a medical practice that is madness.

"All real being," she says, "is in the Divine Mind and idea"; a "false sense evolves, in belief, a subjective state of mortal mind, which this same mind calls matter. . . . Mind is all, and matter is naught . . the only realities are the Divine Mind and idea," which idea, she holds, is man.—*Science and Health,*

pp. 2, 3. This is the Alpha and the Omega of her thinking, and if the innumerable repetitions of this fundamental thought were taken out of her bulky volume, it would shrink into comparatively small proportions.

Her system of mind healing is a deduction from this general principle of the "allness of God and the nothingness of matter." If Mind, or God, is the only reality in the universe, it follows that our perceptive faculties must be counted lying witnesses. Their report as to the reality of the external world being rejected, we must likewise reject their testimony as to our sensations. The universal Intelligence, which is none other than the Divine Mind, cannot be sick, nor can it, being infinite Good, create sin or sickness. Hence it follows that there is, in fact, no such thing as either sin or sickness.

This, then, is the omnipotent truth which is to be prescribed, after approved homœopathic methods, in attenuations high or low, as may suit the symptoms and the patient, in the treatment of all diseases. All may rise superior to sin, to sickness, and even to death itself, simply by refusing to admit their "false claims." "Mind governs the body, not partially, but wholly," says this new saviour of mankind; and if we will but correct our "erroneous beliefs" all will be well with us. The last enemy to be conquered by Christian Science is, of course, death; but while admitting that she and all her followers of this and possibly of several future generations will pass through this phase of mortal belief, Mrs. Eddy holds out steadfastly the hope that ere long the advancing thought and the progressive sanctification of the race will usher in the glad day when there will be no more any belief,

and consequently no further experience, of death on this planet.

With the proverbial blindness of the enthusiast, Mrs. Eddy proceeds to apply her theory to all manner of sickness and of sin, and also to every conceivable question of diet, exercise, cleanliness, hygiene, and sanitary precaution, with every other phase of human life and conduct. In this effort she falls into innumerable absurdities and self-contradictions. Thus, consistently adhering to her assertion that all disease is caused by erroneous belief, and opposed by the fact that young children experience ailments of which they have never heard, and of which they have no idea whatever, she is driven to prescribe for a common ailment of childhood in this way: "A child can have worms, if you say so, . . . timorously holden in the beliefs of those about him."—p. 412. This, then, is her "scientific" vermifuge—Don't say so! And this same prescription, which is, of course, to be taken, like the prescription for boils, in a "high attenuation," is equally efficacious for membranous croup or diphtheria, which also are to be regarded as "timorously holden" in the minds of the fond parents. Few, indeed, will be so foolhardy as to swallow such "scientific" nonsense, and suffer *themselves* to be treated for a "belief," while a precious child lies gasping before them in the agonies of death. And yet this is precisely the practice of Christian Scientists in dealing with the ailments of children who are too young to comprehend the argument which makes up their treatment in the case of adults.

Again, if children, too young to comprehend the philosophy of this new creed, are to be taught to "demonstrate," as was the little tot of whom we are

told in a "scientific" periodical (*Seed,* p. 104) by saying, "God is all, and bumps are nothing," ordinary consistency requires that a "Scientist" shall treat a broken bone in the same way. "If the Science of Life were understood," argues Mrs. Eddy, "it would be found that the senses of Mind are never lost, and that matter has no sensation. Then the human limb would be replaced as readily as the lobster's claw—not with an artificial limb, but with the genuine one."—*Science and Health,* pp. 484-'5. The "unthinking lobster," when he loses his claw, straightway grows another; and our author sees no good reason why men should not do the same thing when they have had a limb amputated by accident or otherwise. Why not heal in all such cases, as in so many others, simply by insisting on the "facts of Being?"[1] Mrs. Eddy can only say, in reply, that "the Science of Life is not yet understood." The fault is not in her theory, but only in the perverse stupidity and unbelief of those who refuse to "admit the supremacy of Mind." Hence, notwithstanding her own marvelous cures of cicatrized and dislocated joints and spinal vertebræ, etc., she is at this juncture driven to confess her faith in the efficacy and necessity of surgical treatment! Christian Science surgery, she avers, is best, of course, but this branch of her new healing art will be the last to be developed; and therefore she advises that "until the advancing age admits the efficacy and supremacy of Mind, it is better to leave the adjustment of broken bones and dislocations to the fingers of a surgeon,"

[1] Our author was forgetful of the fact that *nails* on the extremities of human beings *are* reproduced like the lobster's claw, *from roots;* but limbs have no roots.

while the "scientific" healer devotes his energies to "mental reconstruction and the prevention of inflammation," etc.—*Science and Health,* p. 400. Antiseptics may be dispensed with, if the surgeon will permit, but his skilful fingers are needed—for a time, anyhow! Who does not read between these lines in the new word of God a confession of conscious failure?

Still further, if our bodily sensations and ailments are all due solely to our beliefs, and Christian Science is a "remedy for weather" (pp. 383, 600), then it ought to be in the power of any man whose opinions have been corrected to rise superior to all discomforts due to the weather, or any other causes affecting the temperature about him. If fire does not burn, and cold does not freeze, and there is no danger of pneumonia, why take thought for overshoes and overcoats, and why exercise ourselves about the weather? Why not instruct the children properly—they would believe us, were we to begin in time—and allow them to play in the fire *ad libitum?* "You say," says Pope Mary Eddy, "'*I* have burned my finger.' This is an exact statement, more exact than you suppose, for mortal mind, and not matter, burns it. Holy inspiration has created states of mind which are able to nullify the action of the flames, as in the Bible case of the three young Hebrew captives cast into the Babylonian furnace, while an opposite mental state might produce spontaneous combustion."—p. 54. Now, if Mrs. Eddy can only demonstrate such statements as this, all would be compelled to surrender, and orthodox clergymen would willingly consent to be scourged out of the temple. And yet she takes pains to advise that her theory be not put into prac-

tice just yet on this particular point! "One should not tarry in the storm *if* the body is freezing, or remain in the *devouring* flames. Unable to prevent bad results, one should avoid their occasion. To do otherwise is to resemble a pupil in addition, who attempts to solve a problem of Euclid and denies the principle of the problem because he fails in his first effort."—p. 224. The words which I have italicised are significant. It is a little singular that Mrs. Eddy's next remark following this sage advice, rendered quite necessary by her positive assertion as to the possibility of becoming salamanders by virtue of "holy inspiration," is this: "There is no hypocrisy in Science." And yet she is not willing to allow her own theories to be put to the proof—at least, not just yet! Does not this look like hypocrisy? Observe, also, the very cautious way in which her advice is given. *If* the body is freezing, do not tarry in the storm; and *if* the flames are devouring, do not remain in them. If you find you will neither freeze nor burn, well; if not, get out of danger this time; but try it again some other time! Perhaps, though you fail in your first effort, you may succeed after all! In anywise, do not deny the "Principle" which I have proclaimed as guaranteeing the solution of all the problems of sin and suffering!

It is worthy of note, also, that if Mrs. Eddy's theory is correct, clothing is unnecessary, either for comfort or modesty. As to the former, heat and cold are subjective conditions, and "Mind governs the body, not partially, but wholly"; therefore, the chief thing to be accomplished in the adaptation of our clothing to the changes of the seasons—if, indeed, we are willing to make such an inconsistent concession to the "ma-

terialistic spirit of the age" as to wear clothing at all—is simply to "insist on the facts of Being!" And as to the latter, "there is nothing, either good or bad, but thinking makes it so." Immodesty is an impossible thing to those who are living the life of Science, in any event, if they choose to think so; why not, therefore, refuse to "admit the claims" of mortal sense in this particular, and so rise superior to the "unscientific" mandates of Madame Grundy? Adam in Eden knew not his nakedness; what necessity is there that an immortal should yield to the "impression of nakedness and shame?" Has not Mrs. Eddy taught us, in connection with the fact of Adam's awakening to shame, that man had never lost "his rich inheritance and God's behest—dominion over all the earth?"—p. 525. Yet she does not so much as allude to this question, save in the one hint she has given us, in speaking of Adam's nakedness. And so far as her vague hint means anything, it means that clothing is unnecessary, and shame a delusion of "material man," which may be readily corrected by imbibing Christian Science, and so becoming "spiritual."

Again, if Mrs. Eddy's view as to the supremacy of mind over body is correct, dirt is a mere delusion, and bathing can be as readily effected without soap and water as with them. "Bathing and rubbing to alter the secretions or remove unhealthy exhalations from the cuticle receive a useful rebuke from Christian healing."—p. 381. "The daily ablutions of an infant are no more natural and necessary than would be the process of taking a fish out of water every day and covering it with dirt, in order to make it thrive more vigorously thereafter in its native element. . .

Water is not the natural habitat of humanity."—p. 411. These utterances of our inspired oracle are sufficiently plain to delight a tramp, and are "adapted, if not designed," to elicit the lasting gratitude of all careless mothers. But, nevertheless, "mother Mary" believes that "cleanliness is next to godliness," though she affirms, with all the solemnity of inspiration, that "washing should *only* be for the purpose of keeping the body clean," and that "this can be effected without scrubbing the whole surface daily."—*Ibid.* A whole daily bath, therefore, for infant or adult, is an "unscientific" thing! But why does she not show how to bathe "scientifically" without using any soap and water? If the power of Mind can be relied on to cure cancers, scrofulous affections, and all manner of diseases, alter the secretions, etc., why may we not accomplish the cleansing of the body by mental methods without resorting to any material aids? This is one more instance of Mrs. Eddy's unwillingness to take her own medicine. Her God is everything—except soap and water!

Still another absurdity in Mrs. Eddy's reasoning is found in her discussion of the subject of poisons. Her theory is that all drug action is due to faith in the helpful or deleterious effect of the drug, as the case may be. But what of poisons administered to domestic animals, or taken by mistake? It is a fact that strychnine, whether swallowed by a cat or by a human being, if the quantity be sufficient, will cause death speedily, while the effect of cyanide of potassium, administered to man or beast, is infallibly certain and swift. How can these facts, which are admitted by all Christian Scientists, be accounted for in harmony with their theories? Mrs. Eddy admits

that if a dose of poison is swallowed through mistake, the patient dies, while physician and patient are expecting favorable results.—p. 70. This, notwithstanding her theory that the action of drugs in every case is due to the *expectation* or *faith* of the person taking it. And yet she attempts to account for the event in this way: "A few persons believe the potion swallowed by the patient to be harmless; but the vast majority of mankind believe . . . the drug used to be poisonous," and "the result is controlled by the majority of opinions outside, not by the infinitesimal minority of opinions in the sick chamber."—p. 70. But how could the majority opinion govern the result, when, as she has supposed, nobody knows that a mistake has been made? According to this, the opinion of mankind as to a hypothetical case operates with equal certainty to give a drug its power to take life, whether anybody knows the drug has been administered or not! Thus, the very fact which to all rational minds upsets her theory, she seizes upon as a proof of it! And the same transparent fallacy is her avenue of escape from many other embarrassing difficulties.

Marston, who is perhaps one of the most plausible of Mrs. Eddy's imitators, accounts for the origin of *materia medica* in this way:

> We can conceive a time in the mental history of the race when no therapeutic value was assigned to certain drugs, when, in fact, it was not known that they possessed any. How did it come to pass that common thought, or any thought, endowed them with healing virtue in the first place? Simply in this way: Man finding himself unprotected, and liable to be hurt by the elements in the midst of which he lived, forgot the true source of healing and began to seek

earnestly for material remedies for diseases and wounds. The desire for something led to experiments; and with each trial there was associated the hope that the means applied would prove efficacious. Then what was at first an earnest hope came at length to be a belief; and thus, by gradual steps, a belief in the contents of the entire pharmacopœia was established.

Is it not perfectly obvious that in the case supposed the beliefs as to the action of drugs would grow out of experience? Hope could become belief only when results were favorable; and when the drug proved to be poisonous, the belief that it was a poison would be produced by its poisonous effects.

According to this theory, says Dr. Buckley, "if it were generally believed that alcohol were unintoxicating, nourishing, and bland as milk, it would be an excellent article with which to nourish infants; and if, on the other hand, it were generally believed that milk were intoxicating, all the influences of alcohol would be produced upon those who drank it. If the public could only be educated to believe alcohol to be nourishing, the entire mammalian genus might be nursing their offspring upon alcohol with equally good results."

Such a transparent delusion is but a step from insanity.

But there are more. We quote now a practical question which Mrs. Eddy, in one of her treatises, undertakes to answer. Let the reader imagine it gasped out by a visitor, "fair, fat and forty," who has just arrived panting, perspiring, wheezing, struggling for breath, as she drops into a chair on a hot summer day, after a walk of ten blocks, which she has taken in order that she may propound her important

question to one whom she regards as "the voice of God to this age:"

"How—can I—believe—in no such thing—as matter—when I weigh over—two—hundred—pounds—and carry—about this—weight *daily?*"

Now, we venture to say that in all such cases it is vain for this exponent of a "higher and more practical Christianity" to assure her visitor, as she has done, that "matter is but the manifestation of mortal mind," and that her "weight is an adipose belief of substance." The plain truth is, that Mrs. Eddy has none of that precious remedy—the desire of quacks, the despair of chemists, the long-acknowledged desideratum of the entire medical fraternity—*anti-fat,* in her mental pharmacy. Granting, for the sake of argument, her assertion that "substance is more than matter—even the glory and permanence of Spirit"; that "which is hoped for, but unseen"; and, unlike an "adipose belief," "a thing that the senses cannot take in"; there is, in all these lucid and sublime statements, little encouragement for those who are hopelessly and helplessly FAT. Though she may teach them "the possibility of the absolute destruction of the *consciousness* of weight," is not *that,* in fact, the thing "hoped for, but unseen?" It may be considered as reasonably certain that very few of those who tip the scales at two hundred pounds or over, will ever cease to believe in the reality of matter, Mrs. Eddy's profound philosophy to the contrary notwithstanding. No such creed as hers can succeed without abundance of anti-fat, and the article which she offers to the public is by no means satisfactory.—Vide *Christian Science Series,* No. 1, p. 7.

On a par with Mrs. Eddy's delightful prescription

for fat folks, is her theory as to the way in which men and women may retain youthful vigor and beauty as long as they live. She expostulates against the common mistake of thinking that we are growing old, and quotes from a medical journal the following "sketch from the history of an English lady:"

> Disappointed in love in her early years, she became insane and lost all account of time. Believing that she was still living in the same hour which parted her from her lover, taking no note of years, she stood daily before the window watching for his coming. In this mental state she remained young. Having no consciousness of time, she literally grew no older. Some American travellers saw her when she was seventy-four and supposed her a young lady. She had not a wrinkle or gray hair, but youth sat gently on cheek and brow. Asked to guess her age, those unacquainted with her history conjectured that she must be under twenty. . . . .
>
> This instance of youth preserved furnishes a useful hint that a Franklin might work upon with more certainty than when he coaxed the enamoured lightning from the clouds. Years had not made her old, simply because she had taken no cognizance of the passing years, or thought of herself as growing old. Her belief that she was young proved the bodily results of such a belief. She could not age while believing herself young, for the mental state governed the physical.—*Science and Health,* p. 141.

Thereupon she proceeds to surpass Franklin by deducing a general law from a single alleged fact, which Franklin could not have done. "Impossibilities never occur," she says, and there is no gainsaying that. "One instance like the foregoing proves it possible to be young at seventy-four," she goes on to say; but this oracle must be considered rather doubtful. Proceeding to teach us the secret of maintaining

youthful beauty and strength, even when we are nearing four-score, she dogmatizes on this wise:

> The measurement of life by solar years robs youth and gives ugliness to age. . . . Never record ages. . . . Minute chronological data are no part of the vast forever. Time-tables of birth and death are so many conspiracies against manhood and womanhood. But for the error of measuring and limiting all that is good and beautiful we should enjoy more than three-score years and ten, and yet maintain our vigor, freshness and promise. We shall continue to be always beautiful and grand whenever mortal mind so decrees. Each succeeding year will then make us wiser and better in looks and deeds.—p. 142.

"Whenever mortal mind so decrees," we shall always remain young. And yet she defines mortal mind as "error creating other errors."—p. 583. Such a decree would go far toward proving her definition!

Desiring still further to guard us against the "acute belief of physical life," which is, she intimates, incident to advanced age, while "not so disastrous as the chronic belief," though she does not explain the precise difference between the two, she mentions sundry facts as corroborative of her theory. She has seen a lady of eighty-five who had her second sight, another who had new teeth, and one old gentleman of *sixty* who had retained all his teeth and had not one "decayed cavity!"—p. 143. But, unfortunately for her argument, she cannot tell us that these old people first believed they would regain their sight, etc., and then found the results happening in accord with their expectation. The fact is, second sight and new teeth in old age are always a surprise to those who experience them. As to old people who retain a remarkably youthful appearance, and even sound teeth, such

cases are numerous. The late Charles A. Dana was vigorous almost to the last month of his long life. Beecher died when apparently in the prime of life, and Talmage is stalwart and strong at seventy. Cases in which elderly men and women have little signs of age in their appearance, no gray hairs, and whose natural force is not abated, are numerous; but most of these find their eyes dim. This, according to Mrs. Eddy, is altogether unnecessary; but it will be observed that not a few of these "metaphysical healers" say nothing about the fact that they themselves are under necessity of wearing glasses.

The case of the English lady must be taken with some grains of allowance. All who have much acquaintance with the inmates of our insane asylums can tell of persons who labor under the same delusion, imagining themselves to be young—some of them young girls, who declare themselves engaged to be married to presidents, kings, and even, in some cases, to divine beings—and yet they are hairless, toothless, and decrepit. Now, if a delusion kept the English girl from growing old, as Mrs. Eddy testifies it did, why does not the same delusion produce the same results in others? Again, is it not a little singular that the only case which Mrs. Eddy can adduce in proof of her theory that the mind creates the body, and determines all its sensations, is that of *a lunatic?* This demonstrates the fact, Mrs. Eddy herself being witness, that in order to retain our youth for all time, *we must first become insane;* and it is obvious to all who may lawfully be permitted to go at large that if we cherish such fancies as Mrs. Eddy would have us cherish, it will not be long before our friends will think it wise to send us to those humane institutions

in which persons who fully agree with Mrs. Eddy are sometimes treated for their "beliefs."[1]

I have alluded to Mrs. Eddy's theory that the procreation of the human species is a mental, and not a physical process. Commenting on the creation of Eve, she remarks that "the next change in the manner of mortal birth may usher in the glorious fact of creation—namely, that both man and woman proceed from God, and are his eternal children, belonging to no lesser parent." This is a delicate intimation of her idea that at some future time marriage will be superfluous, and children will be born into the world in some quite transcendental fashion. Again, "did God at first create one man unaided—that is, Adam—but afterward require the union of the two sexes in order to create the rest of the human family? No! He made and governs all."—p. 524. Which means that no union of the sexes is requisite in order to the multiplication of the race. But, with her usual consistency, she is careful to advise her students not to undertake to put her doctrines into practice. "Until it is learned that generation rests on no sexual basis, let marriage continue, and let us permit no such disregard of law as may lead to a worse state of society than now exists."—p. 274. Which is to say, it is bad enough now, and none need make it worse by attempting to put Christian Science doctrine into practice!

Once more, if the doctrine is true that mind controls the body, and is, in fact, the creator of the body,

[1] Three cases have come to my knowledge of persons who became insane through Christian Science. Two are mentioned in a subsequent chapter.—*Author.*

it follows necessarily that human beings need not eat in order to live. Food, like drug-medication, owes its beneficial effects entirely to the belief of mortal mind. Mrs. Eddy does not hesitate to adopt this conclusion, and to urge it with her wonted energy. She affirms it to be "self-evident that food does not affect the existence of man," since God is our only Life. But, just at this point, across the track of her daring thought, a warning signal is displayed. It is displayed in a significant marginal note, "Hasten slowly!" and it is swung with firm hand in the text, as follows: "It would be foolish to venture beyond our present understanding, foolish to stop eating, until we gain more goodness and a clearer comprehension of God."—p. 387. Most wisely, she leaves it to her followers to decide when they have gained sufficient goodness, and a sufficiently clear comprehension of God to warrant them in venturing to do without food! This sage advice is either the dodge of a self-convicted charlatan, or else is a flash of sanity out of an unbalanced brain. Perhaps it is both.

VII.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE AND FAITH HEALING.

Were Christian Science the only system of cure without medicine, its success would be much harder to explain. But healing without medicine is nothing new. Cases in which bed-ridden patients have been enabled to rise, and cripples to throw away their crutches, are so numerous and so well attested as having occurred under the treatment of faith-healers, mesmerists, and even of regular medical practitioners, that the claims of Christian Science in this particular need excite no surprise. Inasmuch as healing by faith has some things in common with Christian Science healing, it may be well at this point in our discussion to consider some of the facts which have come to light as to the success of faith-healers in modern times.

Dr. Tuke, in his great work on the *Influence of the Mind on the Body*, admits that marvelous cures were wrought by Prince Hohenlohe, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Sardica. Among others, he mentions two cases of paralysis. One was an old gentleman, seventy years of age, who had been pronounced incurable, was unable to walk, unable even to open his paralyzed hand, and had been confined to his room for many years. After the Prince had prayed with him he regained his ability to walk, could use his hand readily, and was entirely cured. The other was a young man who had also been unable to use his legs

for two years. After the first and second prayers of the Prince he was partially relieved, and after the third was fully healed.

Joseph Gassner, a Roman Catholic priest of Swabia, effected many cures. Father Matthew, the great Irish temperance reformer, was a very successful healer. Even after his death multitudes visited his tomb, hoping to derive benefit from his sleeping body, and of these many were relieved, and on departing, left their crutches behind them. Roman Catholic traditions tell of many such instances in all ages of the church, and in the light of well-known facts there is no reason to doubt that many cures were effected.

Among Protestants several names are famous in connection with the cure of diseases without medicine, and solely by means of the prayer of faith. One of these was Dorothea Trudel, whose establishment at Manheim enjoyed great reputation. Some remarkable recoveries of health undoubtedly took place under her ministrations.

More recently Rev. W. E. Boardman attained considerable notoriety in consequence of his alleged power with God in healing disease. For many years his faith-cure home in London, known as Bethshan, was frequented by seekers after health. It was reported far and wide that hundreds of cases of cancer, of consumption, even in its last stages, of chronic rheumatism, of paralysis and lameness, had been cured in this establishment; and the canes, crutches, etc., left by the sufferers were shown to inquirers to stimulate their faith. The usual method employed by Mr. Boardman and his associates was to anoint the patient with oil, and then pray, though other means were

sometimes used to excite faith. Many cases were also treated by correspondence, with the same results as those following the treatment in Bethshan.

The name of Dr. Cullis, of Boston, was long famous because of his well-known success in healing disease by prayer and faith. Out of his movement grew the faith-healing work now done in New York, and also at Old Orchard, Maine, under the direction of Rev. A. B. Simpson and others. There is no reason to doubt that a large number have been benefited and many permanently cured by their ministrations.

George O. Barnes, the Kentucky "Mountain Evangelist," claimed to possess healing power. Marvelous cures were alleged also to have been wrought by Mrs. Mix, a Connecticut negress. Many respectable people, "without distinction of age, sex, creed, or color," believed that they had been cured by her prayers, and sincerely mourned her death.

Mrs. R. Stokes Adderton, of Lexington, N. C., a lady of high character, related to the writer that when she was an infant of two months her mother died. The family were greatly distressed to know how the child was to be reared, no wet-nurse being obtainable. A company of Christian ladies united in prayer, the grandmother leading in the petition that God in his mercy would provide some way in which the child could be nourished. *While she was praying she felt her own mammary glands sensibly stimulated,* and, on rising from her knees, she found herself able to suckle the child, which she continued to do until it was weaned.

In all Roman Catholic countries, and also in Russia and other lands under the sway of the Greek Church, may be found places where great stacks of canes,

crutches and splints are exhibited which have been left there by those who, as Dr. Tuke says, there is no reason to doubt have been cured and relieved of contracted joints by the prayers offered at some shrine, or by the supposed efficacy of their relics. The most famous of these shrines is that of Lourdes, in France, whose sacred waters, springing up in the grotto where, according to the faith of all good Catholics, the Virgin Mary revealed herself in 1858 to a peasant girl, are accredited with thousands of cures. To this shrine come pilgrims from all parts of the world, and their gifts have been sufficient to erect a large church, which was consecrated in 1878 in the presence of an immense congregation, thirty-five cardinals and other dignitaries of the Roman hierarchy by their presence or otherwise assisting in the ceremonies. Many whose gifts aided in building this splendid monument to superstition professed to have been cured by the sacred waters of diseases which reputable physicians had declared incurable.

In this category of faith-cures, perhaps, we ought to include the cure of scrofula by the royal touch. This disease was called "King's Evil" by former generations, because it was supposed that the touch of a King was an infallible cure for it. There is ample testimony proving, as well as any historical fact is proven, that royal fingers did effect innumerable cures of this particular malady. The roystering Charles II. touched nearly 100,000 persons, and James, in one of his journeys, essayed to heal as many as 800 cases in Chester Cathedral at one time. Macaulay says that when William III. abandoned the practice it brought upon him "an avalanche of the tears and cries of parents of children who were suffering from scrof-

ula. Bigots lifted up their hands in horror at his impiety." There were those who, denying his right to the throne, insinuated that he feared to try a power which pertained only to legitimate sovereigns; but this contention was altogether groundless, for, says an old author, "the cure of the King's Evil by the touch of the King does much puzzle our philosophers, for whether our Kings were of the house of York or Lancaster, it did cure for the most part."

Nor have faith-cures been confined to Christian lands and to the ministries of Christian ministers and sovereigns. Missionaries and travellers testify that marvelous cures sometimes follow the incantations and other magical rites performed by heathen priests and by the medicine men of savage tribes. The witch doctors of Africa and their congeners among the negroes of our own country do undoubtedly cause, as well as cure, diseases. A community in Georgia, not far from Atlanta, was greatly excited a few years ago by terrible diseases which followed the threats of one of these negro quacks. The ignorant peasantry in many parts of Austria, Germany and Russia, as well as the negroes and some illiterate whites in our own land, still believe in witchcraft, and are ready to adduce many strange coincidences in justification of their belief. The medical profession acknowledges that the facts which prove the success of these charlatans, both in bringing about some distressing troubles and in removing others, are marvelous.

The Mormons claim to have an unbroken record of success in working miracles of healing since the first establishment of their church, and the evidence is conclusive that in not a few cases their claims have been justified by the facts. That the prayers and anoint-

ings of their prophets, apostles and priests have been followed so frequently by recovery from sickness is one of the most convincing of the signs by which they challenge the faith of the ignorant and credulous. The case of Newell Knight, as reported by Joseph Smith, excited great interest in the early days of Mormonism, and led not a few converts into the new prophet's fold. According to Smith's account, Knight's body was acted upon in a very strange manner, his visage and limbs being often "distorted and twisted in every shape and appearance possible to imagine," and sometimes he was "caught up and tossed most fearfully." He thought himself possessed of a devil, and his friends shared the opinion. Being visited by the Mormon prophet, Knight begged him to cast out the devil, professing to believe that Smith could do it. Smith, in compliance with this request, rebuked the devil and commanded him to depart. The devil obeyed, as was believed; Knight was overwhelmed with joy, and, if Smith's account is to be credited, was "lifted by invisible power until the beams of the house would allow him to go no farther!" Knight testified that he saw the departing demon assume the form of a black cat as he vanished in the bush!

The case of Mrs. Johnson, of Hiram, Ohio, was another notable Mormon miracle, and the following are the facts as given by Kennedy:[1]

When Revs. Ezra Booth and Symonds Ryder, both of whom were for a time carried away by the new fanaticism, were investigating the claims of Mormonism, prior to their conversion, they determined to subject the pretensions of Smith to a crucial

[1] *Vide* Kennedy's *Early Days of Mormonism.*

test. Their neighbor, Mrs. Johnson, had suffered from paralysis for six years, being unable to use her right arm, or even to raise it to her head. Accompanied by this lady, with her husband and a physician, Booth and Ryder called on Smith. Without acquainting him with their purpose, the two ministers introduced a conversation as to the truth of the new doctrines which Smith was proclaiming. In the course of this conversation Ryder asked Smith if it were true that he claimed to work miracles. "I cannot work miracles," was the answer; "but I believe that God, working through me, can do so." At a preconcerted signal from one of the party Mrs. Johnson appeared. Said Ryder, "Here is Mrs. Johnson with a lame arm; has God given any power to men now upon earth to cure her?" Thereupon Smith moved backward a few steps, looking intently as he did so into the woman's eyes, and then, advancing to her side, took hold of her palsied hand and raised it to her shoulder, saying solemnly as he did so, "Woman, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, I command thee to be made whole!" Then he abruptly left the room. Mrs. Johnson discovered immediately, to her amazement, and that of all the rest of the party, that her hand, which had been so long useless, was perfectly restored, and it so continued until her death, which occurred fifteen years afterwards. This occurrence had not a little to do with the conversion to Mormonism of the two ministers, both of whom accepted Smith as a prophet; and, though both of them lived to be undeceived, and died in the communion of the churches which they left to embrace the Mormon faith, they did not retract their testimony as to this case, nor even modify it in any particular.

It may be asked, How are all these facts to be accounted for? We answer,

1. As Christians we are compelled to believe that in not a few cases God answers the prayers of his people by healing their diseases. When our Lord was in the flesh he honored the sincere though ignorant faith of the woman who touched the hem of his garment, and we see no reason to deny the *possibility* of healing by divine power in answer to the prayer of faith. This is no more unreasonable in itself than the possibility of conversion in answer to prayer, which no evangelical Christian can doubt. Nor can we deny the possibility of a divine intervention in answer to prayer, even in the case of one who is a pervert to an erroneous creed. There may be Christian Scientists, as there may be Mormons also, who, despite the errors embodied in their false creeds, have yet faith in the love and mercy of God, and are sincerely desirous of glorifying his name. In the case of Christian Scientists, I have been led to think that some persons have been brought, through Mrs. Eddy's presentation of God as Love, to realize the blessedness of the divine love as they never did before—divine mercy answering their prayers and comforting their souls, and even healing their bodies, notwithstanding the errors into which they have fallen. I recall the case of one lady, whom I am compelled to regard a sincere Christian, who declares that she has enjoyed a peace and joy in God as her Saviour and ever-present friend and helper since she became a convert to Mrs. Eddy's doctrines that she did not enjoy before. This is not impossible. She is a woman of untrained intellect, unable to grasp the philosophical subtleties of Mrs.

Eddy's theory, and yet holds steadily to her belief in God as infinitely wise and loving, and "not far from every one of us," if haply we may feel after him.

The mistake of professional faith healers, and of all who have followed them in their wanderings from the truth, has been that of ignoring the limitations of prayer as exhibited in the Lord's Prayer and as illustrated in the experience of our Lord himself. Jesus, in Gethsemane, repeating in his great agony that prayer which he had taught his disciples to repeat, shows us in what spirit we must pray. We must say, as he did, "Thy will, not mine, be done." God has not given men the right to demand any and every blessing at his hands without reference to His own purposes. Sickness may be for our good, since "whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth." In such a case, did we believe, as we should, that our affliction was working out some good purpose, we would pray rather to suffer as long as God might choose to allow us to suffer. "Wife," said a Christian minister to his wife, who had been a patient sufferer from rheumatism, bed-ridden for twenty years, "would you not rather leave this scene of suffering and be with Jesus at once?" "If it is God's will that I should suffer," she answered, "I would rather lie here in pain than to join in the songs round the throne." This was the spirit of an intelligent Christian faith, and that suffering saint whose faith, patience and submission were so perfect was enabled, in her tribulations, to rejoice with "joy unspeakable and full of glory." Were this not true, we should lose much of our comfort in affliction which enables us to sing joyfully,—

"Trials make the promise sweet,
Trials give new life to prayer;
Trials bring me to his feet,
Lay me low, and keep me there."

2. Again, even when prayer for recovery from sickness is answered, it is not necessary to suppose that the divine interposition must be in every case miraculous. When God answered the prayer of Hezekiah it was by sending Isaiah back into the palace with instructions to apply a poultice of figs to the king's carbuncle—a good prescription, as many who have tried it for the same ailment can testify. This, too, is probably the meaning of the apostle's direction in James v. that the sick should send for the elders of the church, who shall "pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord." "The prayer of faith shall save the sick," it is said; and the anointing was required, most probably, because anointing with medicated oils was a common mode of medical treatment in that day.

Physicians were not considered, either in the apostolic or in the Jewish church, as pursuing a calling that was contrary to the Divine will. The words of Ecclesiasticus, pronounced more than two thousand years ago, were doubtless then esteemed as wise as they must be to-day by all who are free from irrational vagaries:

"The Lord hath created medicines out of the earth; and he that is wise will not abhor them. My son, in thy sickness be not negligent; but pray unto the Lord, and he will make thee whole. Leave off thy sins and order thy hands aright, and cleanse thy heart from all wickedness. Then give place to the physician, for the Lord hath created him; let him not go from thee,

for thou hast need of him. There is a time when in their hands there is good success. For they also shall pray unto the Lord, that he would prosper that which they give for ease and to prolong life."

King Asa's mistake was, not in seeking unto the physicians, but in not seeking unto the Lord, who only could bless the remedies they administered. It is by no means improbable that Luke continued to practice his profession as long as he lived, being simply a medical missionary, combining bodily healing with his ministry to the souls of the people to whom he went.

Even when medicines are not used it is unnecessary to assume that recovery from sickness in answer to prayer is miraculous. The forces which cause disease are natural, and those which result in healing are likewise natural.

Our discussion of this subject has made it evident that Christian Science has no monopoly of the privilege of healing without medicine. It may now be inquired, What has Christian Science healing in common with faith-cure? Mrs. Eddy admits that in some instances faith cures are as speedy as her own, but contends, without adducing any fact to support her contention, that faith cures are only temporary, and liable to result in worse diseases. But all that she says about faith in drugs or faith in God as opposed to her doctrine of faith in Mind is self-contradictory. If, in the case of drug cures, which she does not deny, having cured by means of drugs in her own practice, faith in the remedy is the potent cause, ordinary reasoners will be unable to distinguish between the curative potency of faith in a remedy and faith in mind healing. If faith heals in one case, why not say it

heals in the other? Mrs. Eddy's assumption that cures by her method are divine cures, while those by faith-healers are merely cases of self-cure or self-hypnotization, is gratuitous. The fact is, all who place themselves under the treatment of a "Scientist," do so with some degree of faith in the outcome of the treatment. Usually they have been persuaded that Mrs. Eddy has made indeed a wonderful discovery, and that the mind cure is a marvelous and infallible way of healing sickness. This confidence the Christian Science practitioner makes it his business to increase by every means in his power. And, in so far as there is any faith in God, which all "Scientists" profess to cherish, that faith, however ignorant, is one which the Father of mercies may deign to bless. Thus it is evident that Christian Science healing may be counted in some cases but another form of faith-cure.

Aside from Divine interposition, however, the success of faith-healers, of Christian Scientists, and even of African witch-doctors, may be accounted for on principles long ago recognized by the medical profession, and which they seek to apply in their practice. Of these we shall now speak.

VIII.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE vs. MENTAL HEALING BY THE MEDICAL FACULTY.

In the facts now to be related we find the basis of reality which has made Mrs. Eddy's theories so dangerous. Half-truths are more hurtful than whole lies.

It has long been known to the medical profession that a large number of cases can be healed without any medicine whatever. Current medical science takes full account of the mental factors, both in its diagnosis and in its treatment of disease. The mind does, it is universally admitted, produce disease in very many instances, and is all powerful to modify sickness in any case. Much suffering is born of the imagination. Every observant physician soon discovers that as much depends upon the patient's temper and disposition, and upon the mental atmosphere that surrounds him, as upon the therapeutic qualities of the remedies upon which he relies in his attempts at healing. Says Dr. Wood in one of his lectures:[1]

> What physician is ignorant that violent anger may give rise to apoplexy? that sudden emotions, whether of joy or grief, may suspend for a time, if not altogether arrest, the action of the heart? that continued mental excitement is not an infrequent cause of inflammation of the brain? and mental depression of dyspepsia, chronic hepatitis, and various other forms of visceral derangement? that, finally, in the delicate

[1] *Lectures and Addresses,* p. 153.

female, the sensitive nerves often respond in hysteria and convulsions to the rude touches of anxiety and vexation, while even the iron cords of man's constitution sometimes melt before the flames of love?

Carpenter tells us that jealousy will not only vitiate the quality, but increase the quantity, of bile secreted. Murchison affirms that nervous agencies may not only account for functional derangement, but may cure even structural disease of the liver. Tuke "has collected many cases of epilepsy produced by anxiety, fear and grief; of *paralysis agitans* as a result of excessive anxiety, grief, or even joy, while a sudden shock, as of fear, may so disturb the motor centers as to develop a true paralysis." Everybody is familiar with cases in which fear or grief has been known to blanch the hair in a single night. "A succession of horrors, experienced in the wrecking of a train of cars, has cured in a few moments' time an acute articular rheumatism." Hysterical patients, induced to believe that they had inhaled ether, have become so anæsthetized as to bear painful operations without experiencing pain.

"Expectant attention," says Dr. R. L. Payne, now of Norfolk, Va., to whose able and scholarly address on this subject, delivered before the North Carolina Medical Society, I am greatly indebted, "fixed on an organ with the belief that certain results will accrue is often sufficient to produce such results. . . . No organ can functionate properly if subjected to constant surveillance, and woe be to the man who forms the habit of daily counting his pulse, and who, on rising in the morning, must always carefully scrutinize his tongue; and if he but add to his armamentarium a clinical thermometer, there is sure promise of

another devotee at the crowded shrine of hypochondriasis." Nausea is produced frequently by expectation, and the man who in childhood was often dosed with emetics served in jelly may come to find, like this eminent physician, that "all jelly tastes like rhubarb, and is as efficient an emetic as ipecac." Paget, Skey and others have recorded cases of "hysterical joint" almost indistinguishable from the true disease. The bloody sweat of our Lord in Gethsemane, deemed miraculous, possibly, by his immediate followers, is now scientifically accounted for as the physical result of intense spiritual agony; and the well-attested cases of Louise Lateau and of Marie de Moerl show conclusively that the phenomenon of stigmatization, first said to have been witnessed in the case of St. Francis of Assisi, in which the bleeding wounds of Christ seem to be reproduced on the person of the ecstatic, may be induced by the contemplation of vivid mental pictures of our Lord's dying agonies.

Again, without pausing to note the many curious facts adduced by phrenologists in support of their pretended science, the facts of physiognomy speak for themselves, and furnish what seems to be strong argument in favor of the doctrine that all disease originates in the mind and may be cured by the mind. The maiden's blush may spring from wounded modesty, from anger, surprise, love, or embarrassment. Character and passing thought alike make report of themselves through the features of the human face. Vice glasses the eye and thickens the complexion, while purity of character imparts clearness to the countenance and a gleam of truth and sincerity to the eye. Truth and falsehood, intellect and stupidity, all hang out their signals in the human visage. Tenny-

son execrates the "gold which gilds the straitened forehead of the fool;" and who but knows at sight the beaming face and sparkling eye of joy, the quizzical look and merry glance of wit, the scarlet flame or death-like pallor of rage, the frosty gleam and upturned nose of pride or scorn, the compressed lip of avarice, the square jaw and firm mouth of determination, the open face of honest good-will, the drawn features and dull eye of pain, grief and despondency, the attractive mien of humility, or the hang-dog countenance of conscious guilt? Beyond all question, the soul is in some sense a chambered nautilus, building its own shell.

Add to all this the well-known *vis medicatrix naturae,* the tendency of nature to heal. Broken bones knit themselves together, and need only to be properly adjusted, as Mrs. Eddy advises, in order to insure a proper recovery. The bloody gash in the flesh needs only to have its edges sewed together, and to be kept cool and clean, in order to insure quick healing. Antiseptics do not aid in the healing process, but are useful simply in killing the germs which might produce inflammation. Hemorrhage is conservative, and many persons are known to have recovered spontaneously from true pulmonary consumption. The dissecting room has often afforded evidence of this fact when it was probable that the subject himself had never in life realized that he was a sufferer from that dreaded scourge of humanity. Colds and fevers, mumps and measles, and a host of minor maladies, run their course and need little medication, unless the system has been previously disordered, or the type of the disease is especially virulent.

Physicians who have attempted to practice the

healing art without the use of medicines have sometimes achieved marvelous success. Usually some device has been employed, and certain manipulations performed, in order to inspire confidence, while sometimes supposititious medicines, such as bread pills, have been administered after the patient had been induced to believe they would be effective. The success of Dr. Perkins, with his metallic tractors, is well known, and admitted by the whole medical fraternity. He was particularly successful in the treatment of rheumatism, curing stiff ankles, knees, wrists and hips, and this even when the patients had long been ill and the diseased joints had become much swollen. He cured one case of lockjaw in which the rigor had lasted four days, and the attending physicians had lost all hope. The effects of the tractors were at first attributed to galvanism, but it was discovered that the same results followed the use of wooden tractors painted so as to resemble the metal ones.

The case of the paralytic cured by Sir Humphrey Davy by means of a clinical thermometer is famous. Desiring to take his temperature, Sir Humphrey placed a thermometer under the patient's tongue. Thereupon he professed himself better, and asked that he be allowed to keep it there, and Sir Humphrey consented. From that hour the sick man improved steadily, and was soon well, having meantime used no other remedy.

Dr. Buckley, whose volume on *Faith Healing, Christian Science and Kindred Phenomena* is rich in information on this phase of our subject, states that he has frequently relieved the pain in ulcerated teeth by applying to the gums a silver dollar wrapped in silk, the patient being led to suppose it an infallible

remedy. The application was useless when the patient had been informed that there was no efficacy in the silver dollar itself. He relates also how a well-known public singer was relieved of great nausea and intense headache by two applications of the silver dollar, and was then able to perform a full programme with his usual energy.

Another experiment of the doctor is interesting, and shows that, had he chosen, he might have become a worthy successor to the famous Dr. Perkins. Being detained at a ferry, he went into a house and found there a woman afflicted with rheumatism in her hand. Her fingers were very much swollen, and she had been unable to move them for two weeks. Calling for a pair of knitting needles, he held them "about two inches from the end of the woman's fingers, just above the clenched hand, and said, 'Now, madame, do not think of your fingers, and, above all, do not try to move them, but fix your eyes on the ends of those needles.'" She did so, and "to her own wonder and that of her daughter, the fingers straightened out and became flexible without the least pain." He then moved the needles about over the hand, and "she declared that all pain left her hand, except in one spot about half an inch in diameter."

The late Dr. Krackowitzer, of New York, was called to see a young lady who had been ill for a long time, suffering intense pain and unable to move. Her former physician had advised a severe operation, involving deep and painful incisions. The surgeon had come three times to perform the operation, but the parents had shrunk from the ordeal. At last Dr. Krackowitzer was called, and after thoroughly examining the patient, he exclaimed suddenly, in a tone of

command, "Get out of bed, put on your clothes, and go down stairs to meet your mother in the parlor!" She arose at once and obeyed him, took a walk with her mother next day, and soon recovered. This was a case which would have given Mrs. Eddy a golden opportunity, and would probably have gained converts for her new Christianity. Dr. Krackowitzer had recognized it as a case of obstinate hysteria, in which the patient required the stimulus of "sudden command from a will stronger than her own."

Another case reported to Dr. Buckley by an eminent physician was that of a lady who had been suffering for months with rheumatism. Her physician, having done everything else he could think of, at last concluded to give her a vapor bath. Having extemporized an apparatus out of the tea-kettle and some old tin pipe, he introduced the pipe into the bed and instructed the servant to fill the kettle half full. She, however, exceeded her instructions, and filled the kettle so that the steam forced the scalding water up through the pipe into the bed. The instant it reached the body of the patient she jumped out of bed with a shriek, crying, "Doctor, you have scalded me!" Her rheumatism left her that instant, and did not return.

Two cases of cures resulting from shock came to the writer's knowledge. Mrs. John H. Hughes, of Cedar Grove, N. C., was at the time of the Charleston earthquake suffering and almost bed-ridden with rheumatism. She was greatly alarmed by the earthquake shocks, and her rheumatism left her that hour, and did not return for six months. A Mrs. Sullivan, of Shelby, N. C., had been bed-ridden with paralysis, as was supposed, for seven years, when one day some

one informed her that a cyclone was coming. Thereupon she jumped out of bed, ran up stairs, and after recovering from her fright, found her paralysis gone. It was due to hypochondria, and returned after some years. When I knew her she was again bed-ridden, and continued so during the whole time of my pastorate in that place.

Dr. ———, of Wilmington, N. C., cured a lady of hysterical cough by bringing "railing accusations" against her until she was made furious by what she considered his insults. I had the story from her husband, who related it with great glee. It is, perhaps, not to be wondered at that this lady, though not a follower of Mrs. Eddy, is now a devout believer in *mental science healing*.

During the siege of Breda in 1625 scurvy prevailed in the army of the Prince of Orange to such an extent that he was about to capitulate. In their desperation the following experiment was resorted to by the physicians: Three small vials of medicine were distributed to each physician, not enough for the cure of two patients. "It was publicly given out that three or four drops were sufficient to impart a healing virtue to a gallon of liquor." Dr. Frederick Van Der Mye, one of the physicians concerned in the experiment, says that the effect of the delusion was astonishing. "Many quickly and perfectly recovered. Such as had not moved their limbs for a month before were seen walking in the streets, sound, upright, and in perfect health." Before this fortunate experiment they had been, he tells us, in a state of despair, and the scurvy and their despair had brought about "fluxes, dropsies, and every species of distress, attended with a great mortality."

The cases of rheumatic patients who were cured, one by being accidentally scalded, a second by suffering the shock of a railroad collision, and a third by the Charleston earthquake, are in the same category with the cases of consumption referred to by Van Swieten and Smollet, which were cured by falling into cold water.

The late Dr. Buzzell, of Norfolk, Va., during the cholera epidemic of 1832, was summoned to the bedside of a stalwart negro who was in a state of collapse from the dread disease. "Instead of beginning at once to treat him, he accused him of shamming, denounced and derided him in every possible way," and then, feigning intense anger, "procured a switch and began to thrash" him severely. The more the negro groaned and protested that he was dying, the more vigorously the doctor plied his switch, and thus succeeded in bringing about a tremendous reaction, and the negro recovered. Dr. Hunter McGuire, of Richmond, Va., is said to have cured a case of neurasthenia by having the nurses administer to the patient a number of chastisements with rubber rods. The patient, a young lady, had been disinclined to all exertion, and unable to take interest in anything; but the towering passion caused by the doctor's treatment roused her energy, and she returned home cured.

Less severe was the method formerly, if not to this day, pursued by the Oneida communists as related to Dr. Buckley by a sister of John H. Noyes, the founder of the sect. That was treatment by criticism. When one of their number was taken ill a committee was appointed to visit the patient, who entered the room, sat down, and without paying any attention to the

patient, proceeded to speak of his or her peculiarities, bringing every fault to the surface with unsparing condemnation. It was claimed that an epidemic of diphtheria was fought in this way, and not a case died. The irritation produced by this caustic treatment was said to be such that an hour's experience of the ordeal caused the patient to perspire freely, and rapid recovery followed.

Dr. James R. Cocke, in his work on Hypnotism, says he has known an athlete who had been paralyzed a year to be restored to health by "simple suggestion" and a little ridicule. "A friend laughed at him, and told him he could walk if he would. He tried it, and he did."

Glancing over these numerous cases, it will be seen that all the mental causes operating to bring about recovery from diseases may be summed up in three general classes: 1, Mental expectation, induced either by faith or suggestion; 2, Shock, as of accident, fright, vehement command given unexpectedly, etc.; 3, Violent anger, or violent emotion of any sort, which powerfully diverts the attention of the patient from his condition. Christian Science practice, as we shall see, is well adapted to bring all these factors into play.

In addition to these natural causes, which may account for recovery, we must also consider the wide field of coincidence. Thus, if a dyspeptic patient is reading Mrs. Eddy's book, after having eaten imprudently, he will find himself somewhat nauseated. Just at that moment he reads or remembers the paragraph in which Mrs. Eddy assures her readers that if their symptoms seem to be aggravated while reading her book this is itself a favorable sign,

and only the "chemicalization," or ferment, caused by the sacred truth of her volume as it is being assimilated. Having no appetite for his next meal, he fasts, and next day, as a matter of course, his stomach, having been permitted to rest, gives evidence of no unpleasant symptoms, and he leaps to the joyful conclusion that he is being cured! This conclusion is itself, as we have seen, a very helpful thing, aiding nature to correct tendencies toward diseased conditions. The patient of bilious or dyspeptic habits is, perhaps more than any other, dependent upon encouragement and mental expectation, because of the sympathy between the brain and the digestive system; and this being the case, we need not be surprised that patients testify that they have been healed of "chronic hepatitis" simply by reading *Science and Health*. So, also, persons recovering from disease under the treatment of regular physicians may be placed under the care of "Scientists," and their subsequent improvement is attributed to the skill of the "Science healer" instead of to the skill of the physician, whose medicines have relieved organic lesion or functional disorder. And in all the minor maladies which require little treatment, mental healers have an easy victory, and gain laurels without risk.

It is undoubtedly true, moreover, that many patients are benefited by being allowed to do without medicines. Their systems have been irritated or depleted by drastic remedies until the best cure is to let them alone. It is often the case that little children are killed by improper medication. Dr. Paris declared long ago that "the file of every apothecary would furnish a volume of instances in which the ingredients of the prescription were fighting to-

gether in the dark." And what is true of adults is, of necessity, more true of children, who cannot relate their own symptoms so as to aid the physician in his diagnosis. Adults, too, frequently exaggerate their symptoms, and medicines stronger than necessary are administered. Add the fact of empiricism on the part of practitioners who are seeking to introduce new remedies, and the wonder is that so many who are seriously ill do recover.

Nor can we overestimate the therapeutic value of the freedom allowed to patients under the treatment of mental healers in respect of air, exercise and diet. They are relieved of anxiety, assured that recovery will be speedy, required to think and talk about other things than their maladies, and encouraged to eat, drink and sleep, and to attend to their business as if they were well. This sort of treatment is precisely what is needed in many cases of chronic invalidism to induce the "resumption of customary health."

The weight of all these considerations is such as to compel a careful reasoner to return the Scotch verdict of "not proven" when examining into Christian Science miracles, no matter how many Mother Eddy and her children may be able to report. Another class of facts will now be discussed which tend to throw some light on certain mysterious procedures of mental healers, and may account in part for their success.

IX.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE AND HYPNOTISM.

One peculiarity of Mrs. Eddy's system seems to be its pronounced opposition to hypnotism. In her public addresses she has been wont to warn her followers against this "pernicious error," and in her book she devotes a whole chapter to animal magnetism, pronouncing it a "criminal misuse of mortal mind," "mental crime," etc. "The hypnotizer employs one belief to destroy another," she says; "and if he heals a sickness, and a belief originally caused the sickness, it is a case of the greater error overcoming the lesser. This greater error thereafter occupies the ground, leaving the case worse than before it was grasped by the stronger error." Practical people, however, can see little, if any, difference between the hypnotic method as thus very correctly described by her and the method which she herself so laboriously teaches. She tells her patient his sickness is unreal, and when the patient is fully convinced that such is the case he is cured, according to her doctrine. So, also, does the hypnotist proceed. He *suggests* to his patient, after hypnotizing him, that he is now well, and in many cases the results are quite as favorable as those claimed for Christian Science cures.

In a former generation hypnotism was invested with great mystery. It was called "animal magnetism," and it was supposed that some subtle influence was transmitted from the operator to his subjects.

The experiments of Dr. Buckley, however, and of many others have demonstrated that there is needed no exercise of will-power on the part of the operator, and that, in fact, many persons will fall into hypnotic sleep and become subject to suggestion when there has been absolutely nothing done to induce the hypnotic condition. Dr. Buckley relates an experiment performed by himself in which eight gentlemen and ladies were requested to rise, stand without personal contact with one another or with him, clasp their hands and close their eyes for a few minutes. In a little while five passed more or less into the trance state, two becoming unconscious of their surroundings, and the others exhibiting peculiar phenomena. A lady was made to believe that she was writing a letter, and simulated the act by motions in the air. A young man was told that an envelope placed on his head weighed a ton, and his legs trembled under the tremendous burden. A prominent lawyer believed himself sitting on a log looking into the muddy bottom of a creek. Speaking of a young man who, in one of his exhibitions, passed into such a perfect state of trance, according to the village editor, that he was "clairvoyant, ecstatic, mesmeric, somnambulistic, and, in fact, took any form of ideomania at will," Dr. Buckley expresses the opinion that a word would have sent him back to sleep, and that if he had been suffering from any of the diseases which faith-healers could have relieved he would have received equal help. We see also that he would have been a good subject for a Christian Science practitioner.

Dr. Cocke has given reports of a large number of cases treated by himself through hypnotism. They include cases of rheumatism, ulnar neuritis, paralysis,

irritable or traumatic spine, nervous cough, hysteria, vomiting, neuralgia, neurasthenia, and dipsomania. He enumerates also sundry cases in which pain was greatly relieved, one of them being that of a man who had an ulcer on the brain, from which he finally died, but was relieved of pain by hypnotism to such an extent that he passed the last months of his life in comparative ease. He reports a number of cases in which surgical operations were performed upon persons who were hypnotized instead of being put under the influence of ether. He mentions cures effected by hypnotism of persons addicted to the morphine, cocaine, and tobacco habits. "Moral resistance," he remarks, "is the element of hope in all these cases. Sometimes it can be aroused by hypnotic suggestion when all other means fail. Because of this, and for the sake of a wider experience, I plead earnestly for a more extended trial of it."

Mrs. Eddy attributes all diseases to "self-mesmerization." Drs. Cocke, Buckley and other writers on the subject agree that there is such a phenomenon as auto-hypnotism. By concentrating their attention upon some bright object, such as a coin, a bed of coals, or smooth running water, many persons may induce in themselves a trance sleep, in which they will see visions, or imagine many such things as they might be led to imagine at the suggestion of another. Dr. Cocke declares his conviction that many persons who are thought to be suffering from delusional insanity are simply in a state of auto-hypnotism.

The *modus operandi* of hypnotic practitioners is worthy of note as throwing not a little light on the methods pursued by Mrs. Eddy and other mental healers. The practitioner will put the hand of the pa-

tient, if he finds him asleep, into cold water, or in some way apply cold water to his body, and then begin making suggestions. This method may be pursued in some cases when the patient is awake. A Mr. ——, of Buffalo Lithia Springs, Virginia, was hypnotized by Dr. Hodges, of Richmond, at the instance of Dr. E. C. Laird, who found him suffering from a nausea that was intractable by the ordinary remedies. Dr. Hodges simply wet his hand and placed it on the patient's stomach, and after a short interval, said, "You feel better now! Your nausea is leaving you!" The nausea left him that moment, and did not return.

Ordinarily, the hypnotist will ask his subject to look steadily at a coin, a revolving disk, or some other bright object, and concentrate his attention upon that for a few moments. In a little while the sensitive subject will begin to breathe heavily, and will almost immediately fall into sleep more or less profound. In this state he will be completely subject to the will of the operator, and may be induced to believe that water is whiskey, that he is drunk, etc., and will, at the bidding of the operator, do many absurd things. While in this state it is suggested to him that on awaking he will find himself relieved of his disease, and in many cases, as has been shown, the result will be a cure more or less perfect. Many people are so liable to lapse into this state that a word will send them to sleep after one or two experiences. Many hypnotists only require their subjects to look them steadily in the face. This accomplishes the same end as would be attained by requiring them to look at a "magic crystal," such as was used by some of the earlier mesmerists. The only prerequisite, ac-

cording to Dr. Cocke, is voluntary obedience on the part of the subject for a few minutes. When this obedience has been yielded, and the hypnotic state induced, the results are marvelous.

> Beings which are children wholly of his imagination will exist for him as conscious entities. His personality may be changed, and he will for the time think, act and live another man. The various faculties of the mind may be, each in their turn, rendered abnormally acute. The speech centres may act in such a way that the man who has naturally a poor command of language will, when hypnotized, converse volubly, or deliver an address, speaking fluently. The emotions may be played upon by suggestions, like an instrument of music by a master's hand. Joy, sorrow, grief, despair, may be made to follow each other and appear in combination with marvelous rapidity. The man may be made to believe that he is a broomstick, a pitcher, chair or carpet, or any other inanimate thing, and to act his part with wonderful skill.—J. R. Cocke, M. D., *Hypnotism.*

Andrew Wilson, M. D., in a very interesting paper on "Some By-Ways of the Brain," in *Harper's Magazine* for May, 1898, takes the ground that the phenomena of hypnotism, however mysterious they may be considered as yet, are to be explained upon the same principles as the phenomena of somnambulism, mental abstraction and the like. "Things cease to be wonderful," he remarks, "when you can find parallels for them; and when we see in hypnotism merely a further expression of the brain by-way which has led us through sleep and dreams to sleep-walking, we have allocated it to its true position in the series of mental phenomena of which it forms a part. Hypnotism, indeed, has been well styled 'artificially induced somnambulism,' for the phenomena of the one state

are analogous to those of the other, and the actions performed by the sleep-walker run parallel to those which we can induce at will in the mesmeric subject. That which we do effect in hypnotism is essentially the inhibition of the upper brain. We switch off the cerebrum temporarily from its command of the body and allow the central ganglia, under the influence of suggestion, to come to the front in the mental life of the individual."

The persons who are good subjects for hypnotic experiments, it is said, are generally excitable, imaginary, and credulous persons. Men and women of small imagination, free from any tendency toward superstitious vagaries, are not, as a rule, susceptible to hypnosis. Here, however, extremes meet. Many sensible, unimaginative, practical men and women, who are disposed to be incredulous, will run to the opposite extreme as soon as they see something which they cannot explain, and hence become ready subjects, either for the charlatanism of the hypnotist or the palpable humbuggery of the Christian Scientist. In all cases their credulity is the result of their ignorance, and a temporary, stubborn incredulity is sometimes more favorable to sudden effects than the stupid, acquiescent credulity of others who are not so hard to convince, and can be more readily undeceived.

These facts, in connection with others previously noted, are sufficient to explain the alleged powers of mental healers. The treatment given by Christian Scientists, as we shall see, is always solitary. This gives abundant opportunity for hypnotizing without danger of discovery. All the conditions of hypnotic results are present. The mysterious silence of the healer is well adapted to induce in sensitive patients

the highest degree of hypnotic passivity. The "spoken argument" or vehement command is but hypnotic suggestion under another name. "Christian Science," says Mrs. Josephine Curtis Woodbury in a letter to the writer, "is built on the law of suggestion." Voluntary obedience on the part of the patient is yielded from the first moment of treatment. A complete surrender is induced by the reports that may have come to hand of the healer's mysterious powers and miraculous cures, and this confidence, already grown into a feeling of veneration, is further increased by the healer's hints as to thought transference. The patient, having been isolated from all unbelievers in this new method of miracle-working, is assured that the thought of his physician is in itself a healing panacea, which is communicated irresistibly, being a force of such potency that it may be sent round the globe at will. Hence, aside from the power of encouragement and vivid mental expectation, we have the patient in a condition of mind which makes him as clay in the hands of the potter. If dominated by a fixed idea of disease which has no real basis in organic lesions or in unsanitary habits, the healer's suggestions may quickly remove that idea and replace it with another conviction that a real and permanent cure has been effected.

Nor is this all. The power of suggestion, as has been seen, applies to numerous other things besides healing. The hypnotized subject will obey the suggestions of the hypnotizer even after awaking from the hypnotic sleep. To what extent this control of the patient's mind may go is not yet fully ascertained. Gifts and fees may be obtained without doubt through this medium of suggestion. Mrs. Eddy's violent de-

nunciations of "malicious animal magnetism" are, in view of all the facts, as suspicious as the cry of "Stop, thief!" when raised by a certain class under certain circumstances. Much of the instruction in her lectures and in the *Christian Science Journal* consists in explaining this "fashionable and lucrative vice." The charge of occultism, brought against all non-conformists in Christian Science healing by Mrs. Eddy and her followers, comes with ill-grace from those who have adopted as one of the fundamental principles of their healing art the idea that the healer's thought may be transferred to the patient. If healing thought, why not any other? There is, in view of this fact, profound significance in the following criticism of Evans' *Esoteric Christianity,* published in the *Christian Science Journal* of August, 1886:

> If good will to man is the motive of Dr. Evans' book, why does he withhold from the world the manner in which he protects himself from the mental suggestions of others? He virtually owns that if the head of an institution, a faith-curer, be a magnetizer, he can quietly and secretly address persons through thought suggestions, thus inducing them to furnish money for his particular institution. These mental suggestions can reach persons near or remote, and affect them to frenzy until the transferred thoughts are put into action. Later the victim is made happy by a letter from the doctor acknowledging the money as a special dispensation from God in answer to prayer.

I introduce this as a sample of the sort of superstition which is fostered by Christian Science, as well as to show that there is ground for suspicion that hypnotic influence may be attempted by Science healers for selfish ends. If the "thought suggestion" fails,

as it certainly will, what is more natural than suggestion of a more direct and immediate character? Christian Scientists may not be any worse than they suspect faith-healers or "Esoteric Christians" to be,—

> "But Och! mankind are unco weak,
> An' little to be trusted;
> If self the wavering balance shake,
> It's rarely right adjusted."

How much Mrs. Eddy has profited by her studies of hypnotism may be inferred from her reference to the subject in one of her circular arguments:

> We rarely remember that we govern our own bodies. The social error of mesmerism, or hypnotism, . . . illustrates the fact just cited. The operator makes his subjects believe that they cannot move a certain part of the body . . . and they cannot, until at last their belief is better instructed and emancipated by understanding, which masters both belief and fear.—*Science and Health*, p. 401.

The inference here is plain; but in the next paragraph we have it stated clearly. The hypnotist employs "mortal mind" either to produce or to relieve the illusion; but, argues our oracle, all illusions "should be healed by immortal Mind," which simply means by suggestions after Mrs. Eddy's method. In other words, the hypnotic practices of Christian Science healers are legitimate, because, forsooth, they do not rely upon "mortal mind," but upon "immortal Mind!" Not only so, but Christian Scientists are rendering a great favor to suffering humanity by means of their peculiar style of hypnotic practice.

> Mortal mind is constantly producing on mortal body the results of false opinions, and it will continue to do so until this belief is deprived of its imaginary power by Truth, which sweeps away the gossamer web of mortal illusion.—pp. 401-'2.

In order to heal through immortal Mind, it is necessary to fix truth in your patient's thought. To do this you must explain Christian Science to them. This will include instruction as to the power which illusion exercises over their bodies. Hence it is necessary to "destroy the patient's unfortunate belief by both silently and audibly arguing the opposite facts in regard to harmonious Being." "If delusion says, I have lost my memory, you must contradict it," and so of every disease and every infirmity. "You sentence yourself to suffer" is the omnipotent suggestion upon which Mrs. Eddy relies. Thus it is evident that, apart from any mysterious proceedings, the power of Christian Science is due largely to the influence of repeated suggestions. "You are better," "you are well," says the healer, and the sensitive patient is likely to respond if the disease be not one in which organic deterioration has gone too far.

Nor is there in all this anything mysterious and occult. Suggestion is, perhaps, the most powerful means of influencing human thought and conduct of which we have any knowledge. Military commanders issue orders and require obedience. Parents who are wanting in tact can rule only by force. The sand-lot orator, persuaded of the justice of his cause, thinks to gain his ends by personal abuse. The unskilful teacher hopes to rule his pupils by holding the rod or ferrule *in terrorem* over their heads. The unwise pastor, planning some useful work, frets because his people do not see things as he does, and crying, "Thus saith the Lord!" tries to drive his flock forward on the path he would have them pursue. But, while military commanders must rule sternly, and there can be no successful campaign where there is

not rigorous discipline, it is evident that parents, orators, teachers, pastors—all who would rule young or old for their good through their rational natures—must shape their methods so as to take advantage of the laws of mind. One of these laws is the association of ideas. By opportune suggestion a thought of hope or of duty may be so associated with the thing in view as to become a motive, swaying the will. Save in exceptional cases, parents may control their children by making them control themselves, and they can do this by wise and timely suggestion. The skilful teacher learns to make his pupils think for themselves, and by bringing their mental and moral faculties into play, he rules them so wisely that they do not realize how strict his discipline is. The true orator soon learns that the passion which he represses in his public discourses affects his audience even more than his most vehement and passionate utterance; that he is best able to sway a multitude and make them think as he wills when he attains most complete self-mastery; and that, far beyond the power of the thoughts which he pours out, is the power of those thoughts which he has suggested. The most successful pastor is not always the man of most intense spiritual force, but the man who has learned how to *suggest* the thing to be done, and to make the suggestion at the right time.

The power of suggestion is the might of gentleness. Its leaven is the leaven of thought. Open obscenity is repulsive and disgusting; but impure suggestions, cloaked in *double entendre,* are strong agents of the evil one. What we call the power of example is only the suggestive force of righteousness; not so much what a man says and does as the

impression which his presence and his speech make as to the moral principles which guide him. Sociologists are now beginning to account for epidemics of crime on this principle of suggestion; and there are many who believe that a sensational press ought to be curbed by the strong hand of the law, and prevented from publishing the minutiæ of every crime and of every scandal. A recent illustration was afforded in the murder of a woman in New York by means of poison sent to the house in a bottle of bromo seltzer. The New York and London press published the details of the crime, and within a few days a somewhat similar murder occurred in London. Some years ago accounts of the crimes of "Jack the Ripper," committed in London, were published on this side of the ocean, and not long afterward there were similar murders, accompanied by horrible mutilation, committed in New York. The pictures of the "bold, bad life" led by burglars and outlaws in books like *The Life of Jesse James* have been known to lead young boys to organize themselves into bands of burglars. The devil himself used the power of suggestion in the first temptation, and his children have learned from their father through all the ages.

Whether used for good or for evil, then, the power of suggestion is incalculable. And this power is made almost omnipotent when one soul surrenders itself to another. Hypnotic passivity results, as we have seen, from voluntary obedience. The mental powers are freed from the restraint of the will, and the mind is like a boat whose pilot has deserted it, leaving the wheel in the hands of another. Suggestion is the turning of the wheel when the engines are already at work and the screws revolving. Christian Science

patients are passive in much the same way. Surrendering themselves to the healer, they listen patiently to his instructions, obey his directions, even try to think as he directs, and thus prepare themselves to be dominated by the thought which it is his effort to fix in their minds. This thought, repeated in endless reiterations, is, "I am not sick, and cannot be, because Mind cannot be sick, and there is nothing in the universe but Mind and its idea." Uttered in willing ears, it may soon assume the power of a "fixed idea," ruling the after-life of the patient until some mental or physical shock shall rudely rid him of his insane delusion.

X.

THE MIRACLES OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

It is to be regretted that in her books Mrs. Eddy has not given more cases of healing, accompanied by references to persons other than the alleged sufferers. As an excuse for not doing this she pleads that she "never believed in receiving certificates." The public, however, cannot be satisfied with such an excuse, especially in view of the fact that Mrs. Eddy does give some certificates, and even publishes a letter from one who was healed of "bronchitis, dyspepsia, gastralgia and gastritis, etc.," as an appendix to her one hundredth edition of *Science and Health.* The possibilities of faulty diagnosis are such, even when competent physicians are employed, that patients may be very much in error as to the nature and status of their maladies, and it is undoubtedly true that enthusiastic healers of any sect are liable to overestimate the magnitude of the danger from which their patients have been rescued.

But, without pressing this point, let us examine the cases reported by Mrs. Eddy as having been healed by herself.

One is astounded to find in *Science and Health* the statement that Mrs. Eddy "never made a specialty of healing disease," although she asserts, with great modesty, that healing has accompanied all her efforts to introduce Christian Science. Mrs. Woodbury affirms that Mrs. Eddy usually referred applicants for

help to her students, and that "if students failed to cure, it was because of their weakness." Their leader "never failed." Evidently Mrs. Eddy was prudent enough to rest on her laurels after having started her new crusade. It is possible that prudence, not less than preoccupation, may have dictated the notice which has appeared in *Science and Health* in all its multitudinous editions, "The author takes no patients, and declines medical consultation." And yet the assertions and intimations of her ability to heal, should she choose to exercise her powers, are many in all her publications.

In *Unity of Good* Mrs. Eddy makes the statement, "as due both to Christian Science and herself," that she has been enabled to heal instantly a cancer that had eaten its way to the jugular vein. The fact that in sundry other less marvelous cases she has given references makes it somewhat significant that in this miraculous case she gives none whatever, and does not even tell us where nor when the miracle was wrought. Is she sure it was a cancer? What evidence have we, beside her own unsupported statement, to show either that it was a cancer, or that she healed it?

On page 86 of *Science and Health*, to "elucidate her topic," she gives a certificate from James Ingham, East Stoughton, Mass. Mr. Ingham testifies that he was suffering from "pulmonary difficulties, pains in the chest, a hard and unremitting cough, hectic fever," all which unpleasant symptoms disappeared in a short time under Mrs. Eddy's treatment. Now, it is a well-known fact that such symptoms frequently appear when there is no lesion in the lungs. Further, as to whether Mr. Ingham really had consumption,

or only thought himself afflicted with "pulmonary difficulties," the reader is entitled to something more than the patient's diagnosis of his own case, even though that be supported by Mrs. Eddy. The patient may have been mistaken as to the serious character of his symptoms, and Mrs. Eddy is an interested witness.

On page 77 she tells of a lady whom she "cured of consumption," and who, prior to her treatment of the case, was unable to breathe freely when the wind blew from the east. "I sat by her side a few moments," says Mother Mary; "her breath came gently. The inspirations were deep and natural. I then requested her to look at the weather-vane. The wind had not changed, but her difficult breathing had gone. My metaphysical treatment changed the action of her belief upon her system, and she never suffered again from east winds." Here the facts related point clearly to a case of hysteria. It is no unusual thing for hysterical patients to imagine that they have consumption, and during the period in which they cherish this fancy they suffer apparently from many of the symptoms of consumption. But granting, for the sake of argument, that it was a genuine case of consumption, it does not follow that her recovery was due to Mrs. Eddy's "metaphysical treatment," although it is also possible that this may have aided somewhat in the recovery. A change of diet, as we have seen, with recovery from despondency, which might have been induced by any treatment in which she had faith, was sufficient to have produced the same results; or there may have been some accidental wetting, like that in the case reported by Smollett, which was cured by falling into water. Still

further, the name and residence of the lady are not given. Are we to attribute this, in blind credulity, to Mrs. Eddy's want of belief in receiving certificates? How are we to believe her for her works' sake when she refuses to give us proof of her works?

Again, on page 87, she gives an account of a case of "enteritis, following typhoid fever," which she cured. The patient, Miss Pillsbury, had been given up by the regular physicians, and was lying at the point of death. Mrs. Baker, who, it is presumed, is a relative of Mrs. Mary Baker Glover Eddy, as also of the patient, Miss Pillsbury, certifies that Mrs. Eddy (then Mrs. Glover) entered the room and stood —it may be supposed silently—by the bed-side. Very soon Miss Pillsbury recognized her, and said, "I am glad to see you, Aunty." Ten minutes later Mrs. Eddy bade her rise and walk, which she did, walking seven times around the room, and then taking her seat in a chair. For two weeks previous all who had entered the room had been obliged to step lightly, because the patient's bowels were so tender she could feel the slightest jar. Now, however, she was commanded by Mrs. Eddy to stamp her foot strongly upon the floor, and she did so without suffering any pain. The next day she came down to the table, and the third day took a railway journey, etc. Here it is to be noted, 1. That the patient had been under treatment. 2. That Mrs. Eddy stood, it is presumed silently, by her bed-side for some time, and then told her to rise and walk. Here, then, are two possibilities. She may have been relieved of the tenderness in her bowels by the medicines previously administered; or else the case may have been wrongly diagnosed, and may have been simply a case of ner-

vous hysteria, like that treated in a somewhat similar way by Dr. Krackowitzer. There is, assuredly, no proof whatever in this case that Mrs. Eddy's theory is true.

On pages 77-'8 our author gives a report of a case in which she relieved labor pains and brought about a painless child-birth, the mother certifying that she sat up the evening of the same day for several hours, and the next day ate a boiled dinner of meat and vegetables. The third day she dressed, and in a week was able to perform her household duties, running up and down stairs. Her recovery was notable also in that it was recovery not only from the prostration of labor, but also from *prolapsus uteri,* from which she had suffered for several years. In this case it is to be observed, 1. That Mrs. Eddy does not claim to be able to bring about painless child-birth in every case. 2. That one or any other number of such isolated cases would not prove the truth of Mrs. Eddy's theory. There have been instances of painless child-birth in every age, and among savage tribes it is the rule. 3. It is well known that the birth of a child not unfrequently results in the recovery of the mother from uterine troubles.

On page 88 Mrs. Eddy gives three remarkable cases. Mr. R. O. Badgely, of Cincinnati, is quoted as having written, "My painful and swollen foot was restored at once on your receipt of my letter, and that very day I put on my boot and walked several miles." Previously he had written, "A stick of timber fell on my foot from a building, crushing the bones. Cannot you help me? I am sitting in great pain, with my foot in a bath." Here observe, 1. That Mr. Badgely gives no other evidence than his own opin-

ion that the bones of his foot were crushed. 2. Mrs. Eddy herself does not claim to be able to cure broken bones, alleging that it is best to leave the adjustment of broken bones to a surgeon. 3. Mr. Badgely, at the time he wrote first, was sitting with his swollen foot in a bath, presumably, of course, a *hot* bath, which is a specific treatment for bruises, recommended by all the medical faculty. 4. His recovery dates, not from the hour, but only from the day, when Mrs. Eddy received his letter imploring her help. This report, if true, shows conclusively that Mr. Badgely exaggerated his injury, and was cured by a hot water bath, and not by Mrs. Eddy's "absent treatment," of which more anon.

The next case is that of a child who was suffering from ulcerated bowels. His physicians had given him up, saying they could do nothing more for him. He was reduced to a skeleton, was losing strength daily, and could take nothing but the simplest nourishment, such as gruel, etc. *He was taking laudanum.* "Mrs. Eddy came in, took him from the cradle, kissed him, and laid him down again and went out. In less than an hour he was taken up, had his playthings, and was well. All his symptoms changed at once. For months previously blood and mucus had passed his bowels, but that day the evacuation was natural, and the next day he ate all he wanted."

Here, again, the facts show that Mrs. Eddy was in no wise responsible for the cure. The child was practically under treatment, the parents continuing to give him, up to the hour of Mrs. Eddy's visit, the nourishment suitable for his case, and laudanum to quiet his pain. Here was a coincidence, and nothing more. When ulcers have discharged, the healing pro-

cess is very speedy, and appetite is recovered at once. Had Mrs. Eddy not paid her visit to this child, it is quite probable that the cure would have been attributed to the skill of his physicians, who had done all they could do for him.

A still more wonderful case is that of Mr. Clark, of Lynn, Mass. He had been confined to his bed for six months with hip-disease, caused by falling upon a wooden spike when quite a boy. As Mrs. Eddy entered the house she met the physician, who told her that Mr. Clark was dying. She found him with the damp of death upon his brow. The doctor had just probed the ulcer on the hip, and showed the rotten bone adhering to the probe in proof of his assertion that the bone was carious for several inches. The doctor went out, leaving Mrs. Eddy in possession of the field. The patient lay with eyes fixed and sightless. In a few moments after she went to the bedside his death-pallor passed away, he fell asleep, and his breathing became natural. In about ten minutes he opened his eyes and said, "I feel like a new man. My suffering is all gone." She told him to rise and dress himself, and take supper with his family, which he did. She saw him in the yard next day, and was informed that he was well in two weeks, pieces of the wood discharging from his sore as it healed. Mrs. Eddy adds naively that she learns that his physician claims to have cured him, and that his mother was threatened with incarceration in a lunatic asylum for saying, "It was none other than God and that woman who healed him."

The reader will observe, 1. That this story is to be believed on the unsupported authority of Mrs. Eddy. 2. That, she being witness, it shows that the physician

claims to have effected the cure. Mrs. Eddy asks us to believe her statement without hearing the physician, which is, to say the least, not a wise way to decide a controversy. The public has a right to hear both sides of the case. 3. That Mrs. Eddy does not claim to have treated the patient. All she says is that she entered his room, went to his bed-side, and, *after hearing him say he was feeling better,* and *had no pain, told him to rise and dress himself, and sup with his family.* 4. That it is quite conceivable that the physician's discouragement may have been groundless, his patient being, in fact, upon the very eve of recovery in consequence of the remedies used. Cases of recovery after apparent death had supervened are so numerous and well authenticated that, unless already prejudiced in her favor, nobody can believe this case to have been cured by Mrs. Eddy. That the ulcer discharged for two weeks after Mrs. Eddy's visit shows that recovery was in progress, and it is not at all improbable that the physician may have mistaken rotten wood for carious bone. 5. That her command to rise and dress himself, etc., may have been, like the command given by Dr. Krackowitzer, as related above, the means of inducing a more vigorous reaction.

When reading Mrs. Eddy's accounts of her miracles we cannot forget that she has upset her own theory by relating the steps which led her to adopt it. She has told us of her marvelous success in curing typhoid fever with a dilution of common salt, and dropsy with unmedicated pellets of sugar of milk. These cures are attributed by the medical fraternity to the fact of mental expectation. It has long been a practice with physicians to administer harmless remedies,

"*pro forma*," in doubtful cases after inspiring the patient's confidence in the medicine about to be administered. Now, if this is the case in the practice of some regular physicians, the success of Mrs. Eddy in various cases can hardly be adduced to prove anything more than has already been long known, viz., that in certain cases no medicine is necessary, and that satisfactory results can be obtained simply by exciting a proper degree of mental expectation. A friend of the writer, who acted as a sort of assistant surgeon during the war, used to relate with great glee how, on one occasion, being applied to by a soldier who complained of a severe bilious attack, and having no calomel, he compounded a number of bread pills and gave them to the patient with the caution *not* to take more than two before going to bed, and *not* to take any the next morning if the first dose acted properly. The next day the soldier appeared, weak and hollow-eyed from excessive purgation, and complained that those pills were the strongest he had ever taken in his life! Dr. Tuke reports a case in which a patient *dreamed* she had taken rhubarb, and the imaginary drug acted as freely as the actual medicine would have done. Shall we wonder, then, that Mrs. Eddy has sometimes made people think themselves well or recovering?

Mrs. Eddy's theories and methods seem to be particularly adapted to the cure of hysterical affections, to which the weaker sex is specially liable. "Hysteria," says Dr. Buckley,

"Can simulate every known complaint: paralysis, heart disease, and the worst forms of fever and ague. Hypochondria, to which intelligent and highly-educated persons of sedentary habits, brooding over their sensations, are liable, especially

if they are accustomed to read medical works and accounts of diseases and their treatment, will do the same. Dyspepsia has various forms, and indigestion can produce symptoms of organic heart disease, while diseases of the liver have often been mistaken by eminent physicians for pulmonary consumption. Especially in women do the troubles to which they are most subject give rise to hysteria, in which condition they may believe that they are afflicted with disease of the spine, of the heart, or indeed of all the organs. I heard an intelligent woman testify that she had 'heart disease, irritation of the spinal cord, and Bright's disease of the kidneys, and had suffered from them all for ten years.'"—*Faith Healing and Kindred Phenomena.*

The last would have been undoubtedly a witness most valuable for creating faith in the remedial power of Christian Science.

The Rev. Marvin R. Vincent, D. D., is authority for the statement that at St. Luke's Hospital, New York City, a woman with a swelling which her physicians pronounced ovarian tumor was entirely relieved by the administration of ether. The swelling disappeared as soon as the drug took effect, thus proving itself to be the result of hysteria. Had she fallen into the hands of Mrs. Eddy her cure by "mental treatment" would have been probably as quick as that by ether, and it would have gained many adherents for the new creed; or the same result could have been obtained by hypnotizing her, and the hypnotist would have been remembered by all the woman's kindred as a miracle-worker.

Mrs. Eddy has challenged the whole world. The challenge addressed to her by Dr. Charles A. L. Reed, of Cincinnati, which was published in the *New York Sun* of January 1, 1899, is certainly a

fair proposal, but has not been noticed by "Mother Mary."

Mrs. Eddy comes into the arena with her characteristic bravado and challenges the world to prove a negative. She blissfully closes her eyes to the fact that she herself has not proved the positive. On the contrary, her self-heralded wonders rest entirely upon her own unsupported declaration, and that to me and to a great many other people is worth absosutely nothing. She should remember that even people who are not the victims of vagaries such as hers, and whose everyday utterances do not toy so confusingly with the eternal verities as do hers—even such people are expected to bear the burden of proof when they seek to tax credulity. I, therefore, demand the proof of this high priestess, and that the issue may be clearly drawn, I shall take up a few of her declarations, *seriatim:*

Mrs. Eddy says, "I healed consumption in its last stages, . . . the lungs being mostly consumed."

I denounce this declaration as false, and challenge its substantiation by competent and disinterested testimony.

Mrs. Eddy says, "I healed carious bones that could be dented with the finger."

I denounce this declaration as false, and challenge its substantiation by competent and disinterested testimony.

Mrs. Eddy says, "I have healed at one visit a cancer that had so eaten the flesh of the neck as to expose the jugular vein, so that it stood out like a cord."

I denounce this declaration as false, and challenge its substantiation by competent and disinterested testimony.

When Mrs. Eddy speaks of "malignant tubercular diphtheria" as among her cures she, by her own phraseology, proclaims her utter ignorance of one of the most dangerous of diseases, now nearly bereft of its horrors through the beneficence of modern medical science—a disease chiefly of defenceless childhood that she and her fanatical followers would sacrifice upon the altar of their tragic egoism.

But if Mrs. Eddy has done all of these wonders she can do them again. If she is so devoted to humanity in the altruistic fashion that she proclaims, she will not hesitate to demonstrate her alleged "science" under circumstances that will give it the widest possible influence. To this end, if she will come to Cincinnati I will place at her disposal cases of consumption, cases of cancer, and cases of carious bones. She shall have them under observation for such time as she shall determine, and she shall dictate all details of their management. They shall, however, be under the daily observation of a competent and disinterested person of my choice, but who shall have no voice in their management, and who shall visit them only in her presence. If she, by her Christian Science, shall cure any one of them, I shall proclaim her omnipotent from the housetop, and if she shall cure all or even half of them I shall cheerfully crawl on my hands and knees that I may but touch the hem of her walking dress. If it will be more to the convenience of Mrs. Eddy, and she is not disposed to honor us with a visit, I shall take pleasure in endeavoring through my friends to make a similar arrangement for her at Bellevue or some other New York hospital. If Mrs. Eddy will accept this challenge and cure one or more of the cases, she will thereby demonstrate that she may be something more than either a conscienceless speculator on human credulity, or an unfortunate victim of egoistic alienation.

To which, we suppose, Mrs. Eddy would reply, "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign be given to it." Christian Science healers are not willing to afford proof. They must make the diagnosis, and their word unsupported must be accepted as "confirmation strong as holy writ." Their miracles, as will be seen presently, can only be performed secretly, or in the presence of sympathetic, which is to say, Christian Science witnesses. Mrs. Eddy fears to have her patients exposed to any

risk of being injured by the transference of the unbelieving thought of unsympathetic witnesses!—*Science and Health*, p. 422.

One more fact may be mentioned as aiding the unbiased reader to make up a verdict. It is the marked differences between Christian Science miracles and the miracles wrought by our Lord and his apostles. They did not court privacy when performing their miracles. Lazarus was raised from the dead in the presence of a large number, who had been witnesses of his death. The ruler's daughter was restored to life under circumstances which precluded the possibility of deception. The raising of Dorcas and of Eutychus was public. When our Lord cleansed lepers or cured fevers he did not retire into privacy or resort to any mysterious methods. He simply uttered his word of power. So also when the apostles healed the sick. They spoke in the name of Jesus, and the cure was accomplished in an instant. Not only do Christian Scientists heal privately, and by the use of mysterious methods, but their cures are limited to certain classes of disease. Our Lord healed the ear of the servant of the high priest which had been cut off by Peter's sword. He healed leprosy, the most invincible of diseases. He and his disciples raised the dead. Mrs. Eddy's book has the motto of the new church on its cover, "Heal the sick, raise the dead," but we observe in it no report of any case of leprosy healed, nor of amputated members restored, nor yet any case of resurrection. Christian Scientists claim to work their cures by the same methods by which Jesus wrought his "so-called miracles." Why do their works, both as to character and methods, fall so far below the miracles of our Lord?

Not only is it true that Christian Scientist healers fail to achieve the same results which attended the ministry of the apostles, but they do not always succeed in their attempted cures. Our Lord made no failures. The apostles did what they attempted to do. As we shall see, this cannot be said of Christian Scientists.

XI.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE PRACTICE.

A CAREFUL study of Christian Science methods in healing will convince any unbiased reader that such methods are well adapted to influence all who are peculiarly liable to hypnotic passivity, as well as to create in less sensitive patients a degree of mental expectancy which will often answer the purpose of drug stimulation. Mrs. Eddy gives the following directions to mental healers:

1. The healer must acquire the highest degree of self-confidence. He must watch "lest he be overwhelmed by a growing sense of the odiousness of sin, and by the unveiling of sin in his own thoughts." —*Science and Health,* p. 365. He must suffer no belief in his own ill-desert to mar his peace, and so will be "calm in the presence of both sin and disease, knowing, as he does, that God is Love, and that God is All."—*Ibid.* This blinding of one's self to the thought of his own ill-desert will tend to give him a self-possessed and confident manner, which is of the utmost importance. Again, "To succeed in healing you must conquer your own beliefs and fears as well as those of your patients, and you must rise daily into higher and holier consciousness." This "consciousness" is nothing more than the conviction aforesaid that God is all, etc. The practitioner who can bring himself to believe this, with its resulting doctrines of the unreality of sin and sickness, will feel

himself fully competent to deal with the "beliefs" of others to the contrary, and will comport himself with quite the air of a conqueror, which, in fact, he is, having conquered his own reason and common sense. No mere good opinion of one's self will suffice. "In the Science of Mental Healing it is imperative to be perfect, for victory rests on the side of immutable right." This persuasion of one's own immaculate perfection is a degree of self-confidence which goes far beyond the modesty of the medical profession, and will of itself tend to bring mental healers a multitude of patients. The public is generally willing to give considerable credence to reformers who seem to believe in themselves, and the sick in especial respond readily to the confidence of a physician.

2. Mrs. Eddy advises sympathetic behavior. This, of course, applies to the patient's infirmities, and not to his diseases, which are to be accounted unreal, and not to be admitted as entitling him to sympathy. Nobody can fail to approve "the tender word and gentle touch, sweet forbearance with an invalid's hastiness, and pitiful patience with his fears."—p. 366.

3. It is essential to relieve the patient's fears, change his belief, and rouse mental energy. "Establish the scientific sense of health, and you relieve the oppressed organ, and the inflammation, decomposition, or deposit, will abate, and the disabled organ will resume its healthy functions."—p. 372. Thus, "chills and heat are often the form in which fever [1] manifests itself. Change the mental state, and the chills and fever disappear."—p. 374.

[1] In early editions the words "the fear" stood in this place. Is Mrs. Eddy afraid to say that disease is fear after having said it so often? Or is this a typographical error?

Not only has Mrs. Eddy learned something from the hypnotists, but she has learned something also from the failures of despondent physicians. "By conceding to discord such great power a large majority of doctors depress mental energy, which is the only real recuperative power," she thinks; and hence this very wise and proper advice to her students: "Avoid talking illness to the patient. Make no unnecessary inquiries relative to feelings or disease. Never startle with a discouraging remark about recovery, or draw attention to certain symptoms as unfavorable, or speak aloud the name of the disease. Never say beforehand how much you have to contend with in a case, or encourage, in the patient's thought, the expectation of growing worse before the crisis is past."—pp. 394-'5. Every reputable physician will endorse these as sound rules of treatment, especially when no medicine is to be administered. In his address on "The Mental Factors in the Causation and Cure of Disease," which I quoted in a previous chapter, Dr. R. L. Payne, of Norfolk, Va., advises his fellows of the healing art, in order to inspire confidence, to make a thorough examination. "Carefully interrogate each organ, auscultate, percuss, palpate, scrutinize the tongue, note the pulse and temperature, and investigate the secretions, and if you gain nothing beyond what you have almost intuitively determined, you have none the less impressed your patient with the idea that you have given his condition a proper study, and are competent to treat him." Further, he advises that the patient be given "such mental distraction from his ailment as his condition will admit of," such as pleasant conversation, trips away from home, change of scene, and last, but not least,

the stimulant of hope. "In so far as you can, consistently with truth, lead the patient to believe a given result will accrue, and you will have gone a long way in reaching the end of your medication. Excite his will power, make him believe that much depends upon his own determination, and always remember to administer the cordial of hope."

4. The nurse should be cheerful, and by all means a believer in Christian Science. "An ill-tempered or complaining person should not be a nurse. The nurse should be full of cheerfulness, faith, light—a believer in God, Truth."—p. 394. Aside from the tonic effects of cheerfulness, it is manifest that it would always be best for a mental healer to have as his assistant in the sick-room one who firmly believes in the glorious "Science of Mental Healing."

5. While it is alleged that faith in Christian Science is not needed to insure a cure, the healer must nevertheless take pains to make the patient a convert during the healing process. This is, in fact, but a part of the process. The sick "know nothing of the mental process by which they are depleted, and next to nothing of the metaphysical method by which they can be healed . . . Assure them that they think too much about their ailments, and have already heard too much on that subject. Turn their thoughts away from their bodies to higher objects. Teach them that their bodies are sustained by Spirit, not matter, and they will find rest in God, divine Love, more than in oblivious sleep."—pp. 414-'15. If the patient is only an ordinary Christian, without any acquaintance with the vagaries of Christian Science theology, this will be a good introduction to the blessed religion whose *alias* is the "Science of Mental Healing." It is carefully

coated, and sufficiently like orthodox teaching to be swallowed whole and without suspicion. This process must be kept up during the patient's convalescence. "Explain audibly to your patients (as soon as they can bear it) the utter control which Mind holds over the body. Show them how mortal mind seems to induce disease by certain fears and false conclusions, and how divine Mind can cure by opposite thoughts."—pp. 415-'16.

6. Take pains to isolate the patient from all who doubt the truth of Mrs. Eddy's doctrines. "It is equally important in metaphysical practice that the minds which surround your patient should not act against your influence by continually expressing such opinions as may alarm or discourage, either by giving antagonistic advice or through unspoken thoughts resting on your patient. While it is certain that Mind can remove any obstacle, you yet need the ear of your auditor. It is more difficult to make yourself heard mentally when others are thinking about your patients or conversing with them. Therefore you should seek to be alone with God and the sick while treating the cases confided to your care."—p. 422. This will enable the mental healer to get the patient completely under his influence, and also to hypnotize him, should he choose to do so, without being discovered.

7. The healer must in certain cases use authority, and *order* the patient to get well. "If it becomes necessary to startle mortal mind in order to break its dreams of suffering, vehemently tell your patient that he must awake."—p. 418. It has been seen that *shock* of almost any sort is useful in bringing about reaction. Dr. Krackowitzer shocked his patient by commanding her in a loud voice to get out of bed and

dress and go down to the parlor; and we have referred to a case in which the shock of a railroad accident has cured rheumatism. Now, Mrs. Eddy is wise in her generation, and an example to all wise physicians, in thus advising her students to rouse the patient, if possible, by vehement commands. If the patient should resent this method of dismissing his ailments, an explanation is always in order. "Should you thus startle the mind in order to relieve its fears, afterwards make known to your patient your motive for *this shock,* showing him that it was to facilitate recovery."

8. The healer should never be discouraged by a relapse. "If, from any cause, your patient suffers a relapse, meet the case mentally and courageously, knowing there can be no reaction in Truth."—p. 417. The doctrine that there is no reaction in Truth, which cannot be denied, since Truth in this system is but another name for God, is to be maintained at all hazards, even though the patient should die while the healer is trying to make him walk, as in the case of Mr. Kershaw, related in the next chapter. If the facts don't agree with Mrs. Eddy's theory, so much the worse for the facts. And, besides, what effect would facts have in destroying the conviction of Christian Scientists that "there is no reaction in Truth?" This oracle is sufficiently Delphic to meet any emergency. Not death itself among mortals could change the Changeless.

9. Mrs. Eddy recommends the "silent treatment" as ordinarily best, though permitting the spoken argument when this seems necessary. The value of the silent treatment is supposed to reside in the fact that thoughts transferred from healer to patient without

words are, if anything, more effective than thoughts transferred through speech. "If you mentally and silently call the disease by name as you argue against it, as a general rule the body will respond more quickly—just as a person replies more readily when his name is spoken," says Mrs. Eddy, though she recommends a more excellent way, which is, "to let Spirit, through the power of Divine Love, bear witness, without arguments, to the healing Truth."—p. 409. Which is to say, let the healer simply think that Spirit will certainly heal the disease, whatever it may be, without engaging in a mental argument with the disease or with the patient. He must "silently reassure his patient as to his exemption from disease and danger." "The silence of Christian Science and Love is eloquent."—p. 410.

Other mental healers have carried Mrs. Eddy's hints out to their logical sequences. Helen Wilmans says that thought is a force, a kind of ether, which goes where you send it. I deem it unnecessary to discuss the question of telepathy in this connection. Suffice it to say, there is no proof that in any case the thought is really transferred. Some effect is undoubtedly produced in the way of exciting expectation by the healer's mysterious silence. He is *supposed* to be treating the case, and thinks he is. Further, he is known to be attempting to heal through mental power alone; and this thought is already transferred to the patient, even before the silent treatment begins, unless the patient happens to be unconscious, in which case the only mental treatment possible or rational is to wait silently until the patient awakes from his stupor. If he happens to awake feeling better, as is frequently the case, the mental healer is ac-

credited with a partial cure before he has uttered a word.

It is evident that this silent treatment has in it all the elements of "therapeutic suggestion," and is well adapted to influence sensitive subjects who are liable to hypnotize themselves.

10. Mrs. Eddy recommends "absent treatments," and her followers and imitators have elaborated her theory, and have profited by the credulity of thousands. "Science can heal the sick who are absent from their healer," she says, "as well as the present, since space is no obstacle to Mind."—p. 71. Following in her wake, Hazzard declares, "There is no space nor time to mind. A person in St. Louis may be near to me while I am in New York. A person in the same room may be very distant. Sit down and think about the person you wish to affect. Think long enough and strong enough, and you are sure to reach him." Mrs. Eddy, in one of her publications, reports one case of heart disease which she cured without even seeing the patient, who afterwards wrote, "The day you received my husband's letter I became conscious for the first time in forty-eight hours, . . . and sat up. . . . The enlargement of my left side is gone, and the doctors pronounce me rid of heart disease. I had been afflicted with it from infancy. It became organic enlargement of the heart and dropsy of the chest. I was only waiting and almost longing to die, but you have healed me. How wonderful to think of it, when you and I have never seen each other!"

With reference to this case, upon which Mrs. Eddy relies strongly, Dr. Buckley remarks:

What can this prove? What evidence is there that she would not have become conscious if the letter had not been written? If she were ever to come out of an unconscious state and recover, it must be at some time. The coincidence of Mrs. Eddy's receiving a letter from the husband does not show any connection between the two facts, for such letters have been sent and the patients died. To my personal knowledge her treatments have failed, and her predictions have not been fulfilled, the patients dying in excruciating agony. Instances which have occurred, and can be reproduced at any time, of the attempted absent treatment of *persons who never existed* are numerous, for there is not one of this class of healers who cannot be imposed upon. This is sufficient to raise a powerful presumption that the spiritual presence which they evoke, and to which they speak, is "such stuff as dreams are made of."

Mrs. Eddy assumes thought transference as an established fact. Professional hypnotists have more to say about the possibility of thought transference than others, and Hudson claims that experimental telepathy is much more easily produced when hypnotism is practiced after the method of Mesmer. The hypnotized subject, it is claimed, will experience all the sensations of the hypnotist. This similarity of teaching is suspicious.

11. Before leaving the subject of Christian Science practice, it is well to bear in mind another statement of Mrs. Eddy's, as to what constitutes the most favorable condition of success in Christian Science healing. This is *ignorance* on the part of the patient. "A patient thoroughly booked in medical theories has less sense of the divine power, and is more difficult to heal through Mind, than an aboriginal Indian who never bowed the knee to the Baal of civilization."—*Science and Health,* p. 381. The last clause is omitted in

recent editions, so that instead of "than an aboriginal Indian," etc., we read "than one who is not." The reason of this revision is plain.

Perhaps the following specimen treatment, as reported by Helen Wilmans, will indicate somewhat the elements of power in this style of healing:

I said to him mentally, You have no disease; what you call your disease is a fixed mode of thought arising from the absence of positive belief in absolute good. Be stronger, I said; you must believe in absolute good. I am looking at you, and I see you a beautiful, strong spirit, perfectly sound. You are not diseased; the shadow of a doubt is reflected in your feet, but it has no real existence. There, look down yourself, and see that it is gone. Why, it was a mere negation, and the place where you located it now shows for itself as sound as the rest of your body. Don't you know that imperfection is impossible in that beautiful structure, your real self? Since there is no evil in the universe, and since man is the highest expression of good amidst ubiquitous Good, how can you be diseased? You are not diseased. There is not an angel in all the spheres sounder or more divine than you are. Then I spoke aloud, "There, now," I said, "you won't have that pain again." As I said it *there was a surge of conviction through me that seemed to act on the blood vessels and made me tingle all over.*

Here is "therapeutic suggestion" again.

XII.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE FAILURES.

Mrs. Eddy contends that all medical systems are fraudulent, and based on a supposititious "material law"; but she takes pains to advise her students to follow, in their practice, substantially the same rules that are obeyed by all intelligent physicians. In addition to these directions, she adds such recommendations as are adapted, if not designed, to hypnotize sensitive patients, and in any event to insure to the mental practitioner, in case the patient recovers, the credit of accomplishing a cure.

But our new healing oracle claims to have discovered an infallible rule, an undeviating principle, which she spells with a capital P, by which all diseases may be cured, food rendered unnecessary, cold and heat defied, and death itself driven from earth. Here is her argument:

> If mathematics presents a thousand different examples of one principle, the proving of one example authenticates all the others. A simple statement of Christian Science, if demonstrated by healing, contains the proof of all here said of it. If one of the statements in this book is true, every one must be true, for not one departs from its system or rule. You can prove for yourself, dear reader, the Science of Healing, and so ascertain if the author has given you the correct interpretation of Scripture.—*Science and Health,* p. 539.

No finer specimen of Mrs. Eddy's logic than this paragraph can be found. It is the very quintessence

of the aroma of her thought. It consists of four statements, the first of which is an axiomatic truth, while the rest are transparent fallacies. When it has been shown that $(a+b)^2 = a^2+2ab+b^2$, a principle has been illustrated which enables us to find the square of the sum of any two algebraic quantities. But it does not follow from this mathematical truth that if Mrs. Eddy succeeds in healing one case of disease, she thereby demonstrates her rule, and much less her own infallibility. Neither can it be said that if one statement in her book is true, all of them are true. In trying to lug into her arguments a great many facts to prove her theory, she has made glaring mistakes, both in her reasoning and in the facts upon which she has built her arguments. If she adduces as proofs facts that are not facts, her argument is weakened by just so much as she relies on those facts; and yet her argument is, that if she states one fact correctly, this proves that she has made no erroneous statement in any particular! Suppose the magicians of Egypt, prior to their miracle-working contest with Moses, had declared that all their miracles were wrought by the same rule, and that if they succeeded in working one, their success proved the truth of their whole system. Those who accepted that reasoning as conclusive would have been compelled to close their eyes to facts when the time came that these magicians could no longer "do likewise with their enchantments." And this is precisely what Mrs. Eddy would have us do. Her success in a single instance proves her infallible. Her failures must be accounted for without in anywise denying her "rule."

Nor, again, would any number of cures by Christian Science methods prove that Mrs. Eddy's interpre-

tations of Scripture are correct. As we have seen, Catholics, Greek and Roman, Protestants, Mormons, and even heathen medicine-men, have succeeded in healing diseases according to their several rules. Does this prove that all the diverse interpretations of Scripture adopted by Roman Catholics, Protestants and Mormons are correct? Does it elevate heathenism to the same platform of demonstration with Christianity? It must be so, if Mrs. Eddy's logic is right. Her argument proves too much. Her difficulty is in confounding mathematical with moral certainty, and then assuming that her method has all the certainty of a mathematical principle. She is wrong in both directions. Many passages of Scripture are not susceptible of interpretation with certainty. The facts necessary to explain them are not at hand, and when we have the facts, there may be differences of opinion as to precisely what the facts prove. Besides, Mrs. Eddy's method is neither mathematical nor philosophical. The only true scientific method is to deduce a general law from a large number of facts in which, certain conditions being present, the sequences are absolutely uniform. If Newton had found that some of his apples fell toward the moon and passed out of sight, while others fell into his lap, he would never have discovered the law of gravitation. But he found that all apples fell toward the earth, and by further experiments was able to deduce his law. There were no exceptions.

Now this is a very simple and elementary principle of reasoning, which Mrs. Eddy has ignored, if indeed she ever learned it. Her patients—including, if I am not mistaken, one or more of her husbands—have died under Christian Science treatment. Does that prove

anything? Are we not bound to conclude that if she fails in one case her rule must be wrong? Must we take the familiar ground that "exceptions prove the rule," and assume that the greater the number of exceptions, the better the rule is proven? Or must we conclude that a failure occurring in the practice of people who profess to heal *all manner of diseases* on "a demonstrable Principle," shows conclusively that their so-called "Principle" has not yet been demonstrated? Take the following case in point:

Thomas Greenwood Kershaw, leader of the Christian Science congregation in Tacoma, Washington, died of acute pneumonia November 12th as a result of his refusal to receive medical treatment. According to reports he was a man of the highest education and intelligence, and until he identified himself with Christian Science was one of the most active and successful business men in Tacoma. Since embracing that doctrine, though himself a sufferer from a broken hip, he had devoted his entire time to promulgating the faith and administering to the afflicted. When taken ill Mr. Kershaw, despite the entreaties of his family, refused to see physicians, and placed himself in the care of a woman Christian Science healer at Savannah, Ill., who, he said, was able to relieve him, regardless of distance. He was visited by several of his Christian Science followers, and at their suggestion he rose from the bed and took a step forward. He would have fallen had he not been caught. It was then found that he was dead.—*Philadelphia Medical Journal.*

This is but a typical case. This man saw no inconsistency in his course, notwithstanding his own inability to heal, or find some one of his associates who could heal, his broken hip; and yet he persists in trusting the theory which he has embraced until he is dying, and at last falls dead in the very act of rising

from his bed to demonstrate the unreality of his sickness! If this man had obeyed the dictates of reason, he would have remembered the proverb, "Physician, heal thyself," and would not have risked his life on the treatment for pneumonia, which he supposed himself to be receiving from a woman two thousand miles away.

In the Charlotte (North Carolina) *Observer* of November 27, 1898, the following item, copied from an exchange, appeared:

> The pretensions of Christian Science have again been brought prominently before the public by the death of the gifted correspondent, Harold Frederic, and the verdict of the coroner's jury that the persons responsible for his death were guilty of manslaughter. Here is a sort of summary of the Christian Science doctrine as taken from the book of Prophetess Eddy:
>
> "You say a boil is painful; but that is impossible, for matter without mind is not painful. The boil simply manifests your belief in pain through inflammation and swelling, and you call this belief a boil. Now administer mentally to your patient a high attenuation of truth on this subject and it will soon cure the boil. The fact that pain cannot exist where there is no mortal mind to feel it is a proof that this so-called mind makes its own pain—that is, its own belief of pain."
>
> Nothing could be more complete than this demonstration of the non-existence of pain and disease if the patient could only be brought to realize it, and could arise and walk and enjoy himself, just as a well man does. Unfortunately for Harold Frederic, he was not able to realize this absence of pain until he was dead, after which no further complaint was heard from him. Before his death, however, he begged not to be abandoned to the Christian Scientists, but he had no longer strength of will to drive them away.

Cases might be multiplied, but these will suffice for our purpose.

Now, in view of the fact, which nobody can deny, that every person who has ever been treated by Christian Scientists must die some time, and that many die, as did Messrs. Kershaw and Frederic, while they are under treatment, do not these ever-recurring exceptions to her "rule" show that it cannot be relied upon? If twice two sometimes made four, and other times did not, what faith could we have in the multiplication table?

Christian Scientist healers are discreetly silent as to their innumerable failures. Every instance in which their treatment is followed by the recovery of the patient is set down as a "demonstration" of Christian Science. Failures count for nothing, unless to show that the practitioner failed to "realize" the Truth. Does it not stand to reason that if Mrs. Eddy had discovered a certain method of healing all manner of sickness, and even of conquering death, her success would be so invariable as to show the world that it is wrong in rejecting her theory?

XIII.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE BODY ON THE MIND.

I HAVE accounted for the success of mental healers by exhibiting the mental factors in the cause and cure of disease. Mental expectation, or faith, violent emotion, shock, which causes extraordinary excitement, and either "simple" or hypnotic suggestion, have been shown to be influences sufficient to explain many remarkable cures, leaving out of view the vast possibilities of coincidence. But we may not conclude that drugs are useless, and all diseases due to mental causes. Two considerations, both of which are obvious, will prevent thoughtful readers from adopting Mrs. Eddy's hasty generalization. One is, that the classes of disease which have been successfully treated by mental methods do by no means exhaust the category of human ills. One case of alleged cancer is paraded. The testimony is challenged, and no attention is paid to the challenge. Rheumatism, neuralgia, nervous dyspepsia, and all the diseases that may be simulated by hysteria and hypochondria, are conceded to afford a profitable field for Christian Science experiment; but Mrs. Eddy confesses the weakness of her system on the score of surgery. Many illnesses can only be relieved by surgical treatment. Another consideration is, that the influence of the body over the mind is a fact as well attested by the medical profession as the influence of the mind over the body. Mrs. Eddy, as we have seen, seizes

upon the latter principle, and urges all the facts which medical science presents on that side of the question as proofs of her theory as to the uselessness of drugs. She ignores a class of facts even larger, which demonstrate to any mind open to conviction that the human body affects the mind quite as much as the mind affects the body.

The Scriptures contain a number of instances in which this principle is illustrated. Esau, hungry and dispirited after his fruitless chase, despises his birthright, and sells it for a mess of pottage. Jonathan, faint with battle toil, finds that his "eyes have been enlightened" by the honey which he has tasted. Elijah, under the juniper tree, is discouraged and ready to die, and God not only encourages him, but first of all gives him rest and food. Says a brilliant writer, who has wrought nobly under the burden of constant infirmity:

> It is now coming to be well understood that largely the bodily temperament acts upon the mind; that often the fears of the brave and the follies of the wise can be resolved into neuralgia, catarrh and dyspepsia. The condition and coating of the tongue have become not only the tell-tale of the physical man, but the barometer of his spirits. The animal part leaves its mold on the ethereal. As a dent on a can prints the blow on the core of yielding lard within, so the touch of disease disorders the mind. Insanity is a lesion in the organs.
>
> The diagnosis of spiritual distempers would be more sure if there was better acquaintance with the morbid functions of the human frame. How often are good men in heaviness, not by reason of sin, but through vitiated secretions or disturbed circulation. They mistake the cause of lowness of spirits. "Asbury," says Bishop McTyiere, "was subject to melancholy and dejection." The reader of his journals can

see how his exhausted powers, unstrung nerves, indifferent health and overtaxed strength dragged down his soul into a slough of desperation. Sad utterances come from weariness and disease. There are hints in the pastoral epistles of hesitation and the misgivings in Timothy. Paul exhorts him to courage and cheerfulness, but wisely also prescribes for his indigestion and "often infirmity," the source probably of mental disquietude and spiritual distrust.

In the autobiographies of saintly people we find them at times writing bitter things against themselves. Careful scrutiny will connect these pitiful self-accusations with the bodily confusions and the mental vagaries of the invalid. There is no sadder sight than a godly person treating the natural droopings and dullness—the offspring of physical malady—as the frown of the Almighty. With the departure of the pain the dark pall of doubt and dismay lifts and reveals the mistake of a miasmatic mist for an eclipse of faith.

God knoweth our frame and remembereth that we are dust. The highest place among the celestials will not be given to the saint of hearty appetite, sound sleep and thorough digestion. When the Job of saffron skin, of rasped nerves, scalded epigastrium and dismal liver can command himself and not curse God and die, he is a hero of patience and worthy of exaltation. And consider what a magazine of explosive sin is in such a soul, and exposed to the fiery darts of Satan! . . . With the tongue dripping with exudations from viscous glands, what a force is needed to restrain expectoration of venom on rivals! What martyrdom to keep silent and swallow his own bubbling bile! Be thankful for the smallest civility of speech from mortals whose dinners decay without digestion, inflaming the blood and leaving on the lip a bitter cud.[1]

Every wise physician, and every thoughtful soul outside the ranks of Christian Scientists, will approve

[1] Rev. J. J. Lafferty, LL. D., in *Richmond Christian Advocate.*

these statements. We are "fearfully and wonderfully made;" and one of the most fearful and wonderful things about us is that our frames of dust do so clog and hinder the freedom of the immortal mind. An abscess in the liver will becloud the most sanguine spirit, nor will the darkness disappear until the surgeon has made an incision, drawn off the poisonous pus, and introduced a drainage tube. Why is it that the consumptive is ordinarily so cheerful, and often succeeds in doing a vast amount of useful work, even when in the advanced stages of his disease, while the sufferer from jaundice is melancholy, and incapacitated for either mental or physical exertion? In the one case, the disease is attended with a fever which quickens the circulation, and drives the blood toward the head, flushing the cheek and also nourishing the brain, while in the other the circulation is sluggish, the brain is anæmic, and the whole system is left without proper nourishment. It is a well-established fact that drugs which alter the disturbed secretions, and relieve the system of noxious matter, will invariably bring relief from distressing mental symptoms, as well as clear the complexion, and change the coating of the tongue.

Christian Scientists claim peculiar success in dealing with insanity. This may well be questioned save in cases of hysterical mania. Many of the facts of insanity and its correlated forms of disease, such as epilepsy, paralysis, and cretinism, are such as effectually explode the theory that all disease originates in the mind; though it has been proven conclusively that insanity may result from the acceptance of Mrs. Eddy's views.

Medical science has long ago demonstrated that

in every case of insanity there is some lesion in the brain substance. The brain is now mapped out, and the skilful surgeon can often determine, by a study of his patient's symptoms, not only the character of the lesion, but in many cases the precise locality of the brain in which it can be found. Where there is no sign of injury on the surface of the skull, surgeons may and do succeed in diagnosing the cause of paralysis accurately, and have raised the skull, or removed buttons of bone from the interior surface, the result being the patient's complete recovery. That insanity is often due to concussion and fracture of the skull is now thoroughly established. Folsome mentions a case reported by S. K. Towle (*Pepper's System of Medicine,* p. 145) of a soldier who was, when he entered the army, a model young man, amiable and affectionate. On his return from the army he was admitted into a soldiers' home, where he soon showed himself an example of almost total depravity. He had a small scar on his head, which he attributed to a flesh wound. After his death, which was very sudden, autopsy revealed the presence of a bullet, which had fractured the skull, and, passing through the membranes, had partially entered the brain. The internal table of the skull was splintered, and there was evidence of severe chronic inflammation all round the wound, with an accumulation of pus in the brain at the point where the bullet projected into it. It is now well known that, could an examination have been made by means of the Rœntgen X-rays, the bullet would have been located, the skull promptly trephined, the patient's sanity restored, and his life greatly prolonged. Dr. Buckley reports the case of a negro who

was wounded during the war between the States by a fragment of a shell. He wandered about for several years, to all appearances a drivelling idiot, when certain surgeons became interested in him, and concluded that his idiocy was probably due to pressure upon his brain. They accordingly trephined his skull, and, on lifting the piece of bone which had been pressing down upon his brain, they were astounded as the light of intelligence returned to his eye, and he said, "We were at Manassas yesterday; where are we to-day?" Similar cases, in which operations have brought patients up from the jaws of death, some of them being already in a state of coma, have occurred so frequently in recent years that those who refuse to believe must needs be blind to facts.

Dr. Brown-Sequard, in his lectures on "The Physiology and Pathology of the Central Nervous System," relates a case which is conclusive, as showing that insanity is sometimes due solely to physical conditions. The patient had never exhibited any symptom of mental disease until one morning he became a maniac as soon as he set foot on the floor when getting out of bed. He was forced back upon the bed, and was immediately sane. During the morning he attempted several times to rise, with the same result each time. A physician was called, who, in the course of his examination, discovered that when he held the boy's right great toe with his finger and thumb, the leg was drawn up instantly, and the muscles of the jaw suddenly convulsed, and that when he released the toe, these effects ceased immediately. Further examination disclosed *a small irritated point on the skin,* scarcely visible, and when this was removed by the

knife, the boy was freed from his unpleasant sensations, and they did not return.[1]

Post-mortem examinations have revealed the fact that many cases of insanity were due to tumors, and there is evidence that the irritation and malnutrition due to the presence of tape-worms in the intestines have occasioned serious mental and nervous derangement. Kuchenmeister collected many cases of cystic worms in the brain. In sixteen there were no morbid symptoms during life, due, doubtless, to the slight degree of pressure exerted upon the brain substance. Six cases showed slight evidence of mental disturbance, twenty-four were cases of epilepsy, six of cramp, forty-two of paralysis, and twenty-three of mental disturbance of varying intensity. "Impairment of will is not uncommon in antero-frontal and other cerebral tumors, and failure of memory, depression of spirits, and even acute mania, occur." (*Pepper, System of Medicine,* p. 1038.)

It is well known that congenital insanity is associated always, either with irregular development of the skull or with impairment of the brain tissue, and frequently with other deformities, such as hare-lip, cleft palate, and with defective sight and hearing. In nearly all cases of idiocy this malformation of the skull is marked. Dropsy of the brain, or change in the interstitial tissues, producing pressure, has often been revealed by autopsy in cases of acute dementia. The phenomena resulting from "softening of the brain" are so well known as hardly to require rehearsal.

---

[1] Related also by Dr. Buckley in *Faith-Healing, Christian Science and Kindred Phenomena.*

Many cases of insanity occur during the "evolutional periods of life." Boys and girls who are just entering upon the age of puberty are liable to attacks of melancholia, and sometimes of acute mania, which usually yield to proper treatment, and one type of insanity is known as senile. The insanity of pregnant women is an occurrence so common as to need no comment, and puerperal insanity is on the same plane. In all these cases, when the system is properly toned up, and the secretions become normal, mental health is resumed. Insanity is likewise associated with consumption, with gout, with rheumatism, and with anæmia, the mental symptoms ameliorating or growing worse as the disease yields to treatment, or else progresses toward a fatal termination.

The facts of cretinism are conclusive as to the effect of physical conditions upon mental development. The cretin, according to Beaupré, has a head of unusual form and size, a squat and bloated figure, a stupid look, bleared, hollow and heavy eyes, and a flat nose.

> His face is of a leaden hue, his skin dirty, flabby, covered with tetters, and his thick tongue hangs down over his moist, livid lips. His mouth, always open and full of saliva, shows teeth going to decay. His chest is narrow, his back curved, his breath asthmatic, his limbs short, misshapen, without power. The knees are thick and inclined inward, the feet flat. The large head drops listlessly on the breast; the abdomen is like a bag.

The cretin is usually deaf and dumb, or else able only to utter a hoarse cry. Some show no signs whatever of intelligence. Many are indifferent to heat and cold, and even to violent blows, and are apparently insensible to the most revolting odors. Some are unable to acquire speech, and none of them learn

more than the rudiments of speech, or are able to perform any but the simplest tasks. Many are found to have water on the brain. Others, again, have heads abnormally small, with sutures prematurely ossified, and portions of the brain matter indurated, while in all the anterior lobes of the brain are much lighter than in persons of normal intelligence. The great mass of them, as shown by the researches of Roesch and Niepce, are afflicted with goitres, which appear at the age of arrested development. St. Lager has demonstrated the fact that cretinism is confined to metalliferous districts, occurring most frequently where the pyrites of iron and of copper predominate, and there is much evidence tending to prove that the cause of goitre, which prevails in those districts, is also the cause of cretinism; or, at any rate, as Maffei puts it, "goitre is the beginning of that degeneration of which cretinism is the end." [1]

Add to these facts the phenomena of alcoholism. The intemperate use of alcoholic beverages is now known to result, sooner or later, in a degeneration of the entire brain structure. The brain becomes coagulated, and when this process has gone far enough, the poor drunkard dies of *"mania a potu."* Drs. Pritchard and Esquirol agree in declaring that one-half the insane were first "crazy on purpose" with alcoholics. Lunacy, it has been well said, is "mostly saloonacy." Eminent authorities may be named who assert that one-half the idiots in the land are the children of those who have made fools of themselves through strong drink.

Such facts are inexplicable by Christian Science or

[1] Vide *Encyclopedia Brittanica,* article "Cretinism."

any other theory which attributes all diseases and deformities to mental influence. Besides all this, it must be borne in mind that scientific autopsy and vivisection have given to the medical profession a complete knowledge of the structural character and localized functions of the brain, and that many diseases formerly considered incurable yield readily to the surgeon's knife and saw. We have seen that Mrs. Eddy advises the employment of surgeons. This is a complete surrender of the field. The maxim, *"falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus,"* can be justly applied to any theory which assumes to cure all diseases and all accidental injuries, and yet confesses its impotency in dealing with broken limbs and fractured skulls.

PART III.

THE DOCTRINAL CONTENTS OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

XIV.

AN OLD THEOLOGY IN NEW SHAPE.

Were Christian Science only a system of mental healing, it would deserve to be ranked as a comparatively harmless medical fad, like Thompsonianism and other medical vagaries which, from time to time, have occupied the attention and commanded the faith of multitudes. But that which makes it a dangerous enemy to rational Christian faith is that it claims to be a new system of theology. Mrs. Eddy asserts that she has received a new revelation, which is God's gospel to this age. To this revelation she has given the name of Christian Science. "In the nineteenth century," runs her bold challenge, "I affix for all time the word Christianity to Science, and call the world to battle on this issue." (*Science and Health,* eighty-fourth edition.) It is the hope of all the votaries of this new religion, as Mrs. Woodbury once wrote, to "see all so-called sciences fading away, to give place to the only real science—the Science of Christ-Truth, or Christian Science;" and even more than that, to see all existing Christian churches forsaken, and current Christian theology overturned, as the result of the proclamation of this new gospel. Christian Science is a new Protestantism, denouncing as anti-Christ the whole fabric of evangelical Christian doctrine, and the whole body of orthodox Christian believers.

With such a system there can be no compromise. Challenged to the battle, it will be my purpose in the following pages to demonstrate the anti-Christian character and heathen origin of Mrs. Eddy's theology. She would, indeed, have us surrender our conceptions of every distinctive principle of the Christian religion.

The fundamental postulate of all Christian theology being the *existence of a personal God,* she enters against this doctrine an ambiguous and equivocal denial.

She defines God as "Principle, Life, Truth, Love, Mind, Spirit, Soul," and to these ideas she adds, in a subsequent definition, "Substance, Intelligence," declaring him to be "the great I AM, the all-knowing, all-acting, all-wise, all-loving, and eternal." (*Science and Health*, pp. 9, 578.) There is nothing in this definition which answers to the conception entertained by intelligent Christians. It ascribes to him not only omniscience and eternity, but all action as well, intimating that there is no agent in the universe but God. Evidently she holds to the Pythagorean doctrine that God is the Soul of the universe. She conceives of him as the Divine Essence of all things. In defining him simply as "Spirit, Soul, Mind, Intelligence," she indicates her creed by her use of capitals, meaning that God is the only soul, mind, intelligence, etc. This was the teaching of Pythagoras, and we are not surprised to find a writer in *The Seed* (May, 1893) recapitulating, with manifest approval, the teachings of that ancient philosopher. By following in his wake, heathen though he was, Mrs. Eddy has, in the estimation of her worshippers, only rendered her doctrine more "scientific." To their enamored olfactories it makes no difference if her new, infallible, and unpre-

cedented revelation is found to have the musty smell of out-worn heathenisms.

Having made God an abstraction by defining him in terms which exclude, by necessary implication, the idea of personality, Mrs. Eddy labors to impress upon her readers a still more emphatic denial of the personality of God. "God is identical with nature," she says; he is "natural Good." (*Science and Health,* p. 13.) The opposite view of God as personal she rejects as "anthropomorphism, or humanization of Deity" (page 510), and declares that "if God is personal, there is but one person, because there is but one God!" This must be so, if *God is all.* Orthodox theology makes God, she thinks, "a physical personality," a "corporeal Saviour," while she would have us consider him a "Saving Principle" (page 181). So strongly is she opposed to the recognition of the personality of God that she finds even the term *individual,* as applied to him, "open to objections," because God must be "one alone and without an equal" (page 10).

One is astonished at the new and foreign designations, imported from ancient pagan philosophy, and, as we shall see, even from modern Buddhism, which she prefers to bestow upon God. Terming him "the only Substance," the "Principle of Being," or simply "Principle," "Mind," "Soul," "Spirit," etc., she takes pains not to admit into her nomenclature any term which seems to imply, even faintly, the doctrine of an Almighty Father, as held by all Christendom. True, she sometimes uses the personal pronoun *he* in speaking of the Divine Being, and sometimes she uses the word *Father* or the term *Father in secret* in referring to him, but when she has once waived aside all ideas

of personality in telling us who and what he is, he must remain to her followers nothing but an infinite abstraction.

At first glance, it seems possible that her doctrine in this particular may result from ignorance of the doctrine of the divine personality, as understood by evangelical Christians. Indeed, when speaking of human personality, as well as of the divine, she does not distinguish between the physical and metaphysical senses of the word person. When we say of one, "He possesses an agreeable person," we refer to his appearance; and this seems to be the sense in which Mrs. Eddy invariably uses the word. She seems to think that the very word implies limitation and form. But the distinctive idea conveyed by the word person in metaphysical parlance is, speaking broadly, the conjunction of life with self-consciousness, reason and self-direction, or will. A tree, for instance, is not a person, but a thing. It has life, but not self-consciousness, self-direction, or reason. An oyster is not a person, because it has only life and self-consciousness, lacking self-direction and reason. A dog has life, self-consciousness and self-direction, but is not a person, because it has not reason. A human being or an angel has all these qualities, and may therefore be spoken of as a person. A person, says Locke, "is a thinking, intelligent being, that has reason and reflection." And so, since God has all these attributes, he may be spoken of as a person.

But when we speak of God, we think not only of those qualities which constitute him a person, but also of those attributes in which his infinite glory resides. He is, as our Westminster Catechism has it, "infinite, eternal and unchangeable, in his being, wisdom,

power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth." At a glance it is seen that the divine personality infinitely transcends the human. Man's attributes are all finite, while God is infinite in all his perfections.

But Mrs. Eddy's difficulty as to the doctrine of the divine personality, which involves her in a wholesale denial of Scripture, springs logically from her definition of God as Substance, by which she means the *only* substance in the universe. Hence, she cannot, with evangelical Christians, admit the truth of the Bible doctrine that man is a creation of the divine power, wisdom and love, bearing in his rational nature the image of his Creator. True, she uses the terms "creation" and "creature," but she very often uses other terms, such as "instituted" instead of "created." As we shall see presently, her doctrine is that man is an emanation from God, as a stream is an emanation from its fountain. He is, so far as his mental and spiritual attributes are concerned, part and parcel of divinity. Here is a grave divergence from the teaching of Christendom from time immemorial. Catholic theology has always held that man is not an emanation, not a part or subdivision of God. Were he a part of God, we could not conceive of him as "giving account of himself to God," or as receiving the command, "Depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity," in the day of judgment. But if he is a creature, he is under the divine sovereignty, and if he is a rational creature, he is justly amenable to any law which God may be pleased to make known for his guidance. The persistence of his personality is due to the fact that he is a creature, and not an emanation from God, or a part of God. The whole system of salvation by grace, which is certainly taught in the

Bible, if anything is taught in it, is founded upon the fact that man is a rational, accountable creature. It was because of this fact that when Adam sinned he involved his whole posterity in his fall. His federal relation to his descendants in the covenant of works can be understood only when we contemplate him as a creature in whom, seminally, his whole posterity were contained, so that their fate was bound up necessarily in his conduct. As accountable creatures, both Adam and his descendants became the objects of divine solicitude, and as such they are addressed in the words of gospel warning and invitation. To the fact of accountability the human conscience bears witness, as Paul teaches, even among heathen nations.

That we cannot understand how God could create finite intelligences is no reason why we should reject the Bible doctrine. The fact of such a creation is asserted clearly, repeatedly and unmistakably. "Thus saith the Lord, the Holy One of Israel, and his Maker, Ask me of things to come concerning my sons, and concerning the work of my hands command ye me. I have made the earth, and created man upon it; I, even my hands, have stretched out the heavens, and all their host have I commanded." But Mrs. Eddy does not accept the testimony of Moses and the prophets.

Again, all true worship is founded upon this idea of the personality both of God and man. Only persons can offer worship, and only a person can receive it. Could we conceive of the law of gravitation as the power which created our world and all that is in it, we might feel a great degree of awe in contemplating such a wonder-working principle, but we could not think of praying to it, nor of offering to it such homage as the Scriptures bid us ascribe to the King

of Saints. The denial of the Christian doctrine of the personality of God tends manifestly to take the very heart out of the Christian religion. It bids us reject as meaningless myths the story of Enoch, who walked with God, and "was not, for God took him;" of Abraham, honored in being spoken of as the Friend of God; of Moses, who spoke to God as friend to friend, and "endured as seeing him who is invisible." Relegating all these to the category of superstitious fable, we can hardly find ground for the faith of David, as he cries, "I am poor and needy, yet the Lord thinketh upon me."

And yet in every way possible does Mrs. Eddy urge her denial of the divine personality. Not even when she uses scriptural terms in speaking of him is she content to use them in their scriptural phraseology and in their natural sense. Thus, for instance, when she quotes as a scripture statement, "God is Spirit," she adroitly suppresses the indefinite article, which the correct translation of the original requires, and which is used both in the common and the revised versions. A lawyer is hard put to when, in order to defend his client, he must needs garble the evidence which is part of the court record; what must we think of one who claims to have received a divine revelation, and then includes in her revelation such transparent falsehood?

From what has been said, it is manifest that, unless Christian Scientists are content to stultify themselves by retaining in their conception of God and of his Christ ideas which their creed positively rejects, they can no more engage in the worship of God than they can bow down to the law of gravitation or pray to the precession of the equinoxes. Hence, as I shall show

in the progress of this examination, "Christian Science" worship is quite different from our Christian worship, as we have learned it from our Lord and his apostles.

Further, when she has declared that God, and God only, is "Substance," thereby making him the only reality and the only substance in the universe, it is obvious that by no possibility can Mrs. Eddy escape the charge of teaching pantheism. True, she enters her protest against this charge in sundry passages; but on the principle that we are not bound to accept apologies when the offence is often repeated, and there is never any profession of repentance, we can pay no attention to her repeated disclaimers. The basis of her system is the proposition that *God is all.* This is pantheism, whatever she may say to the contrary; since pantheism, from *pan*, all, and *theos*, God, is the word which theology employs to designate the doctrine that God is all. Nor can we honor her sincerity, save at the expense of her intelligence, when she contends that all who believe that in man soul and body are united, are entertaining a pantheistic idea. Accepting, for the sake of argument, her own false definition of pantheism, viz., that it is the belief in the intelligence of matter, there is no material difference between her theory and that of Spinoza. He taught that there is but one infinite substance, and that all finite existences are but modes or limitations of that one infinite substance. She makes the universe consist of one infinite substance, and views all finite intelligence as the expression or "idea" of that one infinite substance. Her attempts to find and maintain some distinction between this one infinite substance and all created beings, only makes her confusion

worse confounded. The only difference between her system and that of the great Jewish philosopher is one of nomenclature. In either system the question arises, Is all the mind or spirit in the universe one and indivisible? Are we to regard men and angels as distinct personalities, separate intelligent entities, as related to God? or does all finite intelligence and consciousness blend in the one universal consciousness? To these questions, in her works, Mrs. Eddy makes the following reply:

> God is all. He is all the Life and Mind there is or can be. Life is God or Spirit, the supersensible Eternal. The universe and Man are the spiritual phenomena of this one infinite Mind. All consciousness is Mind, and Mind is God. Science declares God to be the Soul of all Being, the only Mind and Intelligence in the universe. All that can exist is God and his idea. Spirit is the only Substance, the invisible and indivisible God.[1]

Such views of God necessitate the rejection of all evangelical teaching as to the origin, nature and moral status of man, the doctrine of atonement, the future life, and every distinctive doctrine of historical Christianity. Mrs. Eddy, as will appear in further quotations from her works, meets the issue courageously, and proceeds to make or to borrow new theology as her system requires.

It may now be inquired, what place does Jesus occupy in Mrs. Eddy's doctrinal scheme?

The place of Jesus in evangelical teaching is such as to secure for him, not only the reverence, but the worship of all Christian peoples. The Scriptures declare

[1] Vide *Science and Health,* pp. 7, 230, 365, 412, 419; and *Unity of Good,* pp. 4, 13, 30, 36 and 59.

his divinity, eternity, and almightiness as the Son of God, and his exalted work as the Word or Revealer of God to man, and the mediator of the new covenant. He "thought it not robbery to be equal with God." He accepted the worship of his disciples and forgave sins. He declared himself to be the future judge of the world. Prophecy heralded his birth, first as the seed of the woman, which would bruise the serpent's head; anon, as the Star of Jacob, and later as the Lion of the tribe of Judah, and still later as the Son of David, and the virgin-born child of Bethlehem. His name is the "Wonderful, the Counsellor, the Prince of Peace, the Everlasting Father." He is also "Emmanuel, which, being interpreted, is, God with us." He is, in his humanity, the Son of Mary and the Son of man; while in his unique personality he is also divine —"God manifest in the flesh." The beloved disciple declares his *eternity* in the words, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God;" his *divinity* in the words, "And the Word was God;" his *humanity* in the words, "And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, . . . full of grace and truth." As God, he created the world, and his being is "from everlasting to everlasting;" as man, he "was made under the law, and became obedient unto death." Innocent in all his life, "holy, harmless, separate from sinners and undefiled in the way," he was able to offer himself as a sacrifice for the sins of mankind. He was both the "apostle and high priest of our profession," and the "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." In the apocalyptic vision he appears to the beloved disciple standing in the midst of the throne "a Lamb as it had been slain," and before him the four and twenty elders fall down, singing the new song,

"Thou art worthy to take the book and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation."

That these teachings of the Scriptures are full of mystery has never been denied. "Without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory." But notwithstanding the mystery involved in his incarnation and also in his redeeming work, our Lord is represented as the only hope of fallen humanity. "There is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we may be saved." Only in him and through him can a guilty sinner find pardon, purity and eternal blessedness. Having died for our sins, he has ascended to the right hand of the Father, and now "ever liveth to make intercession for us." He will be the central figure in that awful solemnity spoken of in the Scriptures as the "judgment of the last day." He himself has foretold the part he will play, the words he will utter, the awards he will render; and John in his vision sees before him all the myriads of the dead being "judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works." It is his word which encourages the saint who is fighting the good fight of faith: "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me on my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father on his throne." To him has been given "a name above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." He is the Alpha and

the Omega of Christian doctrine and of Christian hope.

Mrs. Eddy, however, denies the divinity, the atoning death, and even the personal immortality of the Man of Nazareth! She holds that he was merely a model man, and that he was not, in any sense impossible to others, a Son of God. Rev. Frank E. Mason, one of her students, in his *Reminiscences of the Class Room,* reports her as explicitly denying the divinity of Christ, and as affirming that our Christian worship is idolatry, in these words:

> Jesus was able to do the works that he did because his idea of God was so grand and noble. This lofty conception of divinity permeated his consciousness, and he reflected the greatest power of any man who ever lived simply because his aspirations were the highest.—p. 1.

He was only a man, with a "lofty *conception* of divinity!"

This is broader than the broadest Unitarianism. Dr. Channing himself would have repudiated such doctrine as contrary to the plainest teachings of the Scriptures. Says that great Unitarian preacher:

> Other sages have spoken to me of God. But from whom could I have learned the essence of divine perfection, as from him who was in a peculiar sense the son, representative and image of God—who was especially an incarnation of the unbounded love of the Father? And from what other teacher could I have learned to approach the Supreme Being with that filial spirit which forms the happiness of my fellowship with him? From other seers I might have heard of heaven; but when I behold in Jesus the spirit of heaven, dwelling actually upon earth, what a new comprehension have I of that better world! And when at last I see him *returning* through a life and death of all-enduring devoted-

ness *to those pure mansions of the blessed,* how much nearer are they brought to me! What a new power does futurity thus associated with Jesus exert upon the mind!

Nowhere in all that Mrs. Eddy and her school have written about him can be found a tribute to him that indicates such exalted faith in Christ our Saviour as that which breathes through these words of Channing. Observe the following from Mr. Mason's notes of Mrs. Eddy's lectures:

> Jesus the Christ is the ideal man. The physical embodiment was but the material manifestation of the ideal man. This material manifestation modern Christianity has deified, and by so doing has lost the ideal, worshipping a man after the similitude of the flesh rather than the Creator, which is wholly spiritual.—*Reminiscences of Class Room,* p. 13.

If this means anything, it means that modern Christians worship the *body of Jesus,* and do not worship the Creator! Can anybody believe this monstrous falsehood?

Again, on pages 56 and 57 of the *Rostrum,* we find these words:

> The blunder of the world is in assuming and supposing that the Man of Galilee possessed power in excess of the residue of mankind. . . . Such an ignoble conception of deity travesties justice and equality. . . . A God . . . can have no favorites. . . . Jesus possessed no power in excess of yourself. . . . The Christ-Mind belongs to the universe. It is the generic mind of man. All can assimilate it. It is not the specific mind of the Nazarene. . . . God has no specific son. Man is the son of God.

Which is to say, Jesus was the Son of God only in the same sense in which any other man may count himself the son of God.

Again, in the *Rostrum,* page 101, the same writer declares that "Christ is the image of man, made in the likeness of God," and that "a like conception, that is, the same mind in us that was also in him, transforms us into the Christ of the God-Mind, full of grace and truth."

This goes beyond the hope of the apostles. John, we suppose, voices their expectation when he says, "When he shall appear, we shall be *like him,* for we shall see him as he is." Mrs. Eddy and Mr. Mason agree that we shall be transformed into the Christ, which is to say, *absorbed* into his essence. Of this peculiar doctrine we shall have something further to say.

From of old, theological cranks have tried to identify Melchizedec with Christ. Mrs. Eddy attempts a more startling identification. The first man was not Adam, according to this inspired teacher, but *the man Jesus in a previous incarnation!*

> It was the antedated state of the meek and mighty Nazarene, his life, truth and love spiritual, that antidoted the ills of the flesh and were the first man; it was Jesus, as he expressed himself, Before Abraham was, I am.—*Christian Science Series,* No. 4, p. 9.

Since Christ was only a Buddha—or, to use the phrase of modern Theosophy, with which evidently Mrs. Eddy is in full accord in her entire doctrinal system—an adept, or *mahatma,* which any one else may become by proper effort, it follows that he is not in any sense the Saviour of men. He was a great teacher, and a great martyr to truth. He was crucified, according to Mrs. Eddy, because his "scientific definition of personality" incensed the Pharisees.[1]

[1] *Science and Health,* p. 259.

He was an ideal man—that is, to a considerable extent—but nothing more. He had no gift of power or grace that did not belong equally to the whole race, and can do nothing for us. Each man is his own saviour, and saves himself by imitating, not too closely, the example and character of Christ.

The notion of a vicarious atonement, according to "scientific" theology, is only "the creation of a sentiment;"[1] and the death of Christ effects nothing save for our instruction. Says the Rev. Frank E. Mason, who has been privileged to drink deep from the Pierian springs of Mrs. Eddy's teaching:

> Jesus is the model man over whom we throw the various garments of thought to study their effects; and the privilege is granted each child of God to select the garment which is most becoming. In this sense only is Jesus our Saviour and Redeemer; not vicariously and by substitution, but by poising before us as a model to instruct us in the nature and character of thoughts and their effects upon man, to save us from suffering by donning only those garments that clothed him with joy, and by refusing to be arrayed in the habiliments which bring sorrow and pain.—*Seed,* April, 1892.

This account of the work of Christ, and especially of his agony on the cross, is not only ungrammatical, but it differs somewhat from the doctrine of our Lord and of his apostles. He himself told his disciples that "it behooved him to suffer and to rise from the dead, that repentance and remission of sin should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." And from the Epistle to the Hebrews we learn that "for the joy that was set before him he endured the cross, despising the shame." But, according

[1] *Rostrum,* January, 1895, p. 56.

to Mr. Mason and his new prophetess, all this was a foolish performance, quite unnecessary and unbecoming! Christ saves us by posing before us, after the fashion of a clothier's dummy or a milliner's model, and from his very unsatisfactory experience, as we behold him arrayed in the various "habiliments" of his sometimes erroneous thought, we may learn what garments of thought to don for ourselves! This, for example, is one of the lessons of the crucifixion: "Nothing is gained by suffering for the truth. It is simply a sentimental patriotism so to believe. Suffering is not an essential quota of the divine plan of salvation."—*Ibid.*

Jesus, then, was only a sentimental patriot! He was ignorant of the fact that suffering was not an essential "quota"—whatever Mr. Mason may mean by that—of the plan of salvation! It was a foolish blunder when an apostle wrote: "It became him for whom all things were made, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through suffering." Nay, rather, the Man of Nazareth ought by all means to have avoided the "habiliments which bring sorrow and pain." There have been saints in every age since Calvary who have been attracted toward Jesus because he "bore our griefs and carried our sorrows;" because he was "touched with the feeling of our infirmities," and was, alike in the sadness of his lot and in the perfect sympathy of his two-fold nature, "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief." But to Mrs. Eddy and her inspired school of interpreters, the story of the sufferings of Christ is one which excites in them nothing more than a feeling of compassionate superiority. He ought to have known better; but "at the

time when Jesus felt our infirmities he had not," as he should have done long before, "conquered all the beliefs of the flesh!" He had not yet "risen to his final demonstration of spiritual power."[1] It was through sheer weakness and ignorance that the Man of Nazareth suffered, and all the scriptures which represent that suffering as a part of the divine plan for the redemption of sinners must be set aside, because Mrs. Eddy knows more about the matter than prophets and apostles did, or even than Jesus himself. With her accustomed diffidence—a diffidence which can only be considered bewitching in a "Scientist" who has made such "a sacred discovery" and a prophetess who announces herself as the recipient of a new and final revelation from heaven—this woman "clad with the radiance of spiritual Truth" differs both from "erudite theology" and from Spiritualism. The purpose of the crucifixion was not, she says, to provide "a ready pardon for all sinners who ask for it, and are willing to be forgiven." No! This teaching of "erudite theology,"—which we can see at a glance is fairly and accurately stated!—must be thrown overboard, and we must pity the orthodox simpletons who allow their ministers to preach such a gospel. Nor, again, was the death of Christ "necessary for the presentation, after death, of the material Jesus, as a proof that spirits can return to earth." There was no special need, in her opinion, that "life and immortality" should be brought to light through the gospel. "The efficacy of the crucifixion lies in the practical affection and goodness it demonstrated for mankind." Still further, Christ "proved by his deeds"—amazing

[1] *Science and Health.*

thought!—"that Christian Science destroys sin, sickness and death!" (*Science and Health,* pp. 329, 330.) "Only this, and nothing more!"

The seer of Concord goes even further in her efforts to minimize the importance of the death of Jesus, and in so doing administers wholesale correction and rebuke to such ignorant theologians and preachers as was Paul, and to all in our own time who are so fatuous as to consider Paul good authority in matters of Christian doctrine, and even to the Man of Nazareth himself! Redemption by the blood of Jesus is the key-note of the New Testament, as it was the meaning of the whole Levitical system and the burden of Old Testament prophecy. Under the Mosaic economy it was a principle of the divine law that "without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins." The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, if not Paul himself, is at least Pauline in his teaching as to the relation of our Lord's sacrifice to the pardon of sin. He refers to this principle of the old law as prophetic of the new dispensation, and grounds the believer's boldness as he enters into the holiest, in the fact that the blood of Jesus was shed for the sins of his people. The reprobate, according to him, deserves a condemnation worse than death, because "he hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace." But evidently this primitive Christian writer had not been privileged to "peck his shell open with Christian Science." With her usual malice in misrepresenting orthodoxy, Mrs. Eddy speaks as if the Christian world thought that somehow the blood of Christ was to be smeared on the sinner, and that

God would be delighted with the smell of it, and would be "appeased by suffering." Desiring to correct such a heathenish notion, she informs us oracularly that the "material blood of Jesus was no more efficacious to cleanse from sin when it was shed on the 'accursed tree' than when it was flowing in his veins as he went daily about his Father's business." (Page 330.) In other words, the shedding of his blood was unnecessary, and sinners could have been cleansed without it. How she reaches this conclusion will appear when we come to consider her teachings as to sin, pardon, and atonement.

But these glaring and deliberate contradictions of holy writ are not to be wondered at when we remember that in Mrs. Eddy's scheme all suffering is illusory. If we consider the sufferings of Jesus to have been real, we might properly consider our own sufferings real; and if his sufferings were illusions, they could have been, and ought to have been, avoided. This is the only logical conclusion from Mrs. Eddy's general principle of the "Allness of God and the nothingness of matter." Thus has the "Christian Scientist" reached a height of heavenly contemplation from which he can look down in pity upon the folly and weakness of the poor sense-ridden, suffering Nazarene!

Still another way to discredit the sufferings of Christ is suggested by the female Pope of Christian Scientism. If he suffered—and the *if* in such a connection is significant of her exceeding doubt as to the reality of any suffering on his part—his sufferings must have been caused by the thought or mental influence of others. "If Jesus suffered," she says, "it must have been from the mentality of others." (*Unity*

of Good, p. 70.) That is to say, the agony in the garden, the scourging and the crown of thorns, the buffeting and the shame, and even the torture of the crucifixion, with the hiding of the Father's face, all were created by the mentality of others; and, however real to him in the seeming, were nothing but hypnotic illusions!

In similar fashion does our new infallibility deal with the death and resurrection of Christ. In Christian theology, as understood by Catholic Christendom, these great facts of the mediatorial work of Christ play a most important part. But Mrs. Eddy and her followers have learned how to view them quite differently. Thus, Mrs. Eddy tells us that "in Science, Christ never died. In sense, Jesus died and lives again. The fleshly Jesus seemed to die, though he did not. Mortal sense . . . is all than can be buried or resurrected."—*Unity of Good,* p. 78.

This is a very characteristic passage. The average reader will find here, being accustomed to use words in their sense as determined by common usage, a medley of contradictions. In science, Christ never died. In sense, Jesus did die. But, no! he only *seemed to die,* while in fact he did not: it was his "mortal sense" that died. And we venture to say that almost any practical man, coming to this passage in his first attempt to read the wandering dissertations of the oracle of Concord will determine in his haste that there is no "mortal sense" in Mrs. Eddy or in her doctrine, and lay the book down in disgust. But we must remember that Mrs. Eddy is speaking in a "new tongue," and that her oracles require to be studied. Here is the meaning of this parable: when she speaks of Christ, she does not always mean the Man of Naza-

reth. It was, she holds, not the Christ, but Jesus, who died, that is, "in sense," or in appearance; and so, likewise, he seemed to rise from the dead. But his resurrection was also an illusion, since death, like sin and sickness, is simply a belief of mortal mind—a mere passing fancy. Since, then, there is no such thing as death or resurrection, and, further, since no man's body is a reality, but is only the imagination of himself and of mankind, it is, "scientifically" speaking, incorrect to speak of Christ as dying, etc. *He had no body,* and "Soul cannot die." All that men beheld of him, all that died or was raised from the dead, was his mortal sense, or, in other words, that phantom form to which men, imagining it to be real, gave the name of Jesus.

Mr. Mason reiterates the teaching of Mrs. Eddy somewhat more coherently: "We affirm that he was alive during the three days, despite the fact that he was pronounced dead."—*Reminiscences of Class Room,* p. 5.

This might be understood as implying that the death of Christ was only a suspension of animation; what it means is that the death of Christ was only an appearance, inasmuch as *there is no death.* Again, "The only tomb in which Jesus lay was the world's physical apprehension of him."—*Ibid.*

This statement need not be wondered at. It is nothing more than we should expect of people so "scientific" that they count the sun and moon and stars as "subjective states of the human thought," and nothing more—held only, as Mrs. Eddy tells us the baby's worms are held, in the minds of those who look upon them!

But Mrs. Eddy goes even further in her determina-

tion to idealize our Lord and his redeeming work. Her expressions, when speaking of his birth, seem deliberately intended to cast doubt upon the genuineness of his humanity. She refers to Mary as the "reputed" mother of Jesus, and says that he "wore in part a human form, that is, as it appeared to mortal view, being conceived by"—this term is especially suitable for her purpose here, because of its double meaning—"a human mother." (*Science and Health*, p. 211.) She means that he was conceived *in Mary's mind,* and was her *idea!* Her "conception of him was spiritual" (page 228), not physical. She was thus, in fact, his creator, her mind having projected him upon the world! Thus again:

> The illumination of Mary's spiritual sense put to silence material law, and brought forth her child by the revelation of Truth, demonstrating God as the Father of man. The Holy Ghost, or Divine Spirit, overshadowed the pure sense of the virgin-mother with the full recognition that Being is Spirit. The Christ dwelt forever as an ideal in the bosom of the Principle of the man Jesus, and woman perceived this idea, though at first faintly developed in an infant form. . . Jesus was the offspring of Mary's self-conscious communion with God.—pp. 334-'5.[1]

Thus has she taught that he was an idea Christ, and that his birth, passion, death and resurrection were imaginary.

Just now we caught a glimpse of another peculiar doctrine. Jesus himself is declared in the Scriptures

[1] It is, of course, a mere coincidence that in a similar way Simon Magus accounted for the existence of Helena, his paramour. She was, he said, the first *conception* (Ἔννοια) *of his mind.*—Vide *Encyclopedia Brittanica,* article "Gnosticism."

to be the Christ of God. When he challenged his disciples to say who he was, Peter answered, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Mrs. Eddy, to whom all mysteries are plain, and the faith of prophets and apostles no more important than the vagaries of ignorant children, does not hesitate, in this case, to correct Peter and all catholic Christendom. She would have us believe that it was a mistake to consider Jesus the Christ. He was, she says, not the Christ. He was only "a material manifestation" in which the Christ dwelt. And she has given to "the Christ" the unscriptural, but charmingly "scientific" name of "the Christ-Principle," and speaks of that also as "the Principle of the man Jesus." Bearing in mind her definition of God as Principle, Mind, etc., and her statement as reported by Mr. Mason, that "the Christ-Mind belongs to the universe," and is "the generic mind of man," it is evident that she denies the specific divinity of our Lord by claiming it for the whole race. Of this also, more anon.

Again, Mrs. Eddy differs from the angel who appeared to comfort the disciples after the ascension of Christ. He said, "*This same Jesus,* which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." Possibly she regards the story of this angel's appearance and message as a myth. At any rate she does not believe a word of the account. "The Christ," she says, speaking *ex cathedra, infallible,* "dwelt forever in the bosom of the Father, God," and "this dual personality, of the unseen and the seen, the spiritual and material, the Christ and Jesus, continued until the Master's ascension, when the human, the corporeal concept, or Jesus, disappeared; while his invisible self,

or Christ, continued to exist," etc. (page 229). This antithesis is significant. The term *disappeared* is opposed to the term *continued to exist;* and the meaning is evidently that the humanity of Jesus, which she expresses by "the human, or corporeal concept," was annihilated! It was nothing but an appearance, or idea; and that appearance ceased—that idea was no longer entertained among men! The hope of the church, expressed in that precious Epistle of John, that "when he shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is," was all wrong. Angels, ministers of grace, apostles or prophets, who assert such doctrine must stand corrected by this woman who sees herself in prophecy as "clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet."

But, notwithstanding her denial of the immortality of Jesus, Mrs. Eddy would not leave us altogether comfortless. There is a sense in which we may still realize his presence and power. From *The Seed* (April, 1890) we learn, as its editor has learned from Mrs. Eddy, that the "only right understanding of Jesus" is gained through the recognition of Christ as "the ever-present consciousness of true manhood," and that when Jesus died, he *"diffused his thought* through the universe, and this thought is the leaven which will leaven the whole lump." This thought, too, no doubt, is the leaven which Mrs. Eddy has hidden in her three measures of meal. "The realization of Truth is the Christ-Principle working within, for he said, 'I am with you, even unto the end of the world.'" We are thus emphatically and repeatedly forbidden to believe in the immortality of the Man of Galilee. He is now only—

> "The sweet presence of a good diffused,
> And in diffusion evermore intense."

He is no longer, in his blessed person, our Master. Our only Master, says Mrs. Eddy, is "a Master thought which possesses the mind of each individual." (*Reminiscences of Class Room,* p. 8.) Nor will the blessed Redeemer appear at last in the midst of the throne, "a Lamb as it had been slain." Nay, verily, since " 'the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world' is the sense of individual dominion . . . the inward consciousness of perfection, which lifts us slowly above the claims of matter, to the realization that Mind is all." (*Seed,* April, 1890, p. 98.) Salvation, according to our new oracle, as we have seen, is nothing but complete acquiescence in the teachings of her new creed. The passage just quoted indicates the Christian Science way of salvation clearly. It is to make a Christ of one's own self-conceit, and follow its suggestions until the "inward consciousness of perfection" develops into the assurance of "oneness with God." In all which heresy borders close on lunacy.

But what explanation will Mrs. Eddy give of the second advent? The apostles taught that our Lord would "appear the second time without sin unto salvation." With his second coming they associated the resurrection of the just, and the beginning of the saints' everlasting rest. They expected it to occur "in the end of the world," or æon, of which the ministry of Christ was the commencement. Peter declared that those who should remain until the coming of the Lord should be "caught up with" the saints "in the air," as they came with their Lord back to earth. But Mrs. Eddy is better informed. She has been taught of God, and now teaches us, that Jesus has already come the second time, and that his *second coming dates*

from the year 1866, *and was simply the advent of "Christian Science!"* And as she herself is the sole author of that blessed system, which is the "outgrowth and epitome" of her life, we may say that Mrs. Eddy herself is, for all practical purposes—and Christian Science is "*so* practical"—Christ returned to earth! She has gathered up his diffused thought, and—at least until she discontinued healing—was so full of its aroma that she was omnipotent to heal all human ills, barring only broken bones, and a few other maladies, which it were prudence in a Christian Scientist not so much as to name!—Vide *Science and Health,* p. 43.

Matthew, Mark and Luke all report their Lord as declaring that he would come "in the clouds with great power and glory," and Matthew and Mark report his statement that he would "send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet," and that they should "gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." Mrs. Eddy, indeed, did not make her appearance in the clouds, but only in the midst of New England fog, literal and spiritual; but we have seen that she has, at least among her worshippers, great power and glory, and we hear the sound of her trumpet as she seeks to gather the elect into the true gospel fold of the "Church of Christ, Scientist." Minute discrepancies between the august prophecy and its alleged fulfilment in this feminine Theophany will by no means discourage those credulous people who have had their ailments cured, and who are therefore ready to receive Mrs. Eddy's teachings as the "voice of Truth to this age," and worship her as the "Feminine Principle of the Messianic Expectation."—Vide *Arena,* May, 1899.

The worship of our Lord Jesus Christ is, of course,

out of the question for those who believe his humanity was only a temporary phantom, and that they themselves can claim to be divine as he. This logical result of Mrs. Eddy's reasoning brings her theory into sharp contrast with the gospel as taught by our Lord and his apostles. He exists now as diffused thought, and who ever heard of worshipping thought? We may no longer look back to Calvary, and beholding him whom our sins have pierced, cry in adoring love—

> Oh, Lamb of God! was ever pain,
> Was ever love like thine?

The old gospel was all a mistake, a foolish misunderstanding of God. Paul and John and all the rest of the New Testament writers, and, of course, all the Old Testament writers also, were men who meant well, and testified as best such ignorant men could in the midst of barbarous ages, that were not yet illumined by the "light of Science." But they were as blind leading the blind. Only since a new revelation was vouchsafed to the anointed woman, the Mental Messiah, of this age, have mortals been taught the whole truth—the truth, as Mrs. Eddy boldly affirms, as it was *not* in Jesus. The Man of Nazareth did wrong to accept the worship of his disciples, and all who have been worshipping him through the ages have been guilty of idolatry! The whole Christian world has gone wrong. The blind man, when he was healed; the entire company of the disciples, overwhelmed as they were by the triumphant demonstration of his Messiahship afforded by a splendid series of miracles; Peter, after the miraculous draught of fishes; the multitude gathered to witness the ascension; the company assembled in that upper chamber where the

glories of Pentecost began; the martyr, Stephen, as his soul was departing, and he—doubtless deluded, according to Mrs. Eddy's way of thinking—imagined he saw the Son of man at the right hand of the Father; Paul, as his epistles abundantly show; the early church, which "in every place" called on the name of our Lord Jesus Christ; Catholic Christendom in all ages, which has sought to bring peculiar honors to our King—all have erred most egregiously. They have been worshipping a Saviour who was not only not divine, any more than other men are, but they have continued to worship him *even after he had ceased to exist*. Paul's prophecy, too, was false, when he predicted that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow and every tongue confess that he, Jesus, is the Christ, for Mrs. Eddy says he is not; and the application to Jesus, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, of the words of Messianic prophecy, "And let all the angels of God worship him," was a blunder.

Not only so, but when a Christian poet, paraphrasing the testimony of the evangelical prophet, sings of Jesus—

> To him shall endless prayer be made,
> And endless praises crown his head,
> His name, like sweet perfume, shall rise
> With every evening sacrifice,—

he is exhibiting gross ignorance. Mrs. Eddy summons us from all such "worship of idols," and would have us banish the very name of Jesus from our prayers. She is reported as saying that—

"Worshipping the personal Jesus keeps the world on a physical basis and in a physical belief, making such a religion largely emotional, while, on the contrary, the adoration of

the Christ-Principle, which influenced Jesus in his demeanor, teaches us that we can be like him, and becomes an incentive to labor for such a glorious possibility. The impersonal Christ should be the only object of worship."—*Reminiscences of Class Room*, p. 5.

We have seen her charge, that modern Christianity had deified the "material manifestation" of Christ. Now we have her advice not to worship his person. Why not, if it be not idolatrous in her opinion? The Apocalypse represents him as saying, "I am he that liveth, and was dead, and behold, I am alive for evermore;" but Mrs. Eddy teaches that his humanity does not now exist, his "duality" having ceased at the ascension. If she is right, John is wrong, and the Christian world is now praying to a Saviour who does not exist. Such worship was idolatrous in its origin, and is now worse than idolatrous, if the seer of Concord, N. H., has seen the truth!

The teachings of our oracle as to the Holy Spirit are much more clear and concise, though hardly less inconsistent, than her teaching as to the character and work of Christ. She identifies the Holy Spirit now with Christ himself, and anon with her own precious doctrines. "Throughout all generations," she informs us, "the Christ as the spiritual idea—as the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, has come." (*Science and Health*, pp. 228-229.) And, lest we should fancy him to be a divine spirit, infinitely transcending the "diffused thought" of Jesus, she tells us further that "the Holy Ghost, or Spirit, reveals this triune Principle" of Life, Truth and Love, "and is expressed in Divine Science, which is the Comforter, leading into all Truth, and revealing the Divine Principle of the universe—universal and perpetual harmony" (page 227). Her

doctrine, then, is both the second and third persons or entities in that "triune Principle" which she worships; it is both the Christ, or "spiritual idea," and the Holy Comforter promised by our Lord! This must be so, since it is a mathematical axiom that things which are equal to the same thing are equal to each other.

And, inasmuch as she has taught us that the Christ is the only proper object of worship, and that this Christ appears in "Divine Science," it follows of necessity that the only proper object of worship for mankind is Christian Science! Other people worship their God; Christian Scientists must needs worship their religion!

Thus does she make manifest the fact that the words which she puts into the mouth of "Mortal Sense" in one of her profound allegories are an unwitting declaration of her own fallibility: "Like an airy bubble, I but expand to my own destruction, and shine with the fatal resplendency of error."

It is just a little singular that our inspired author was not satisfied with this specimen of sparkling and iridescent rhetoric. With a few notable exceptions it was the most beautiful and striking sentence in any of the older editions of *Science and Health.* But in the one hundred and fifty-fourth edition she makes it, if possible, even more impressively, though none the less unconsciously, prophetic: "Like bursting lava, I but expand to my own despair, and shine with the resplendency of doom."—p. 148.

Yes, Mrs. Eddy still shines, still expands, and still expects to explode; but shrinking from destruction, she finds expansion tending to despair, and her resplendency is still fatal—the sure foretoken of doom.

Even in describing her own (and our) "mortal sense" she feels that there is something real and substantial about all this unreality. "An airy bubble" is too light, too cool and too transient to describe her mighty spirit, even under such an *alias*. *Her* "mortal sense" is volcanic in its fiery splendor, and, like bursting lava in its majestic upheavals, rushes madly to its fearful fate!

XV.

THE GOSPEL OF NO GOSPEL.

HAVING exhibited the affinities of Mrs. Eddy's system with Pantheism in its teaching as to the being and attributes of God, let us now inquire, What does she teach as to the origin, nature, moral status, and final destiny of man? And what has she to say of angels and demons?

Having, in the primary postulate of her system, made God the sum of all things, it would be impossible for Mrs. Eddy to consider man less than divine. But upon the threshold of this inquiry, we must pause and ask, What does Mrs. Eddy mean by the term, man? Is it, in her new tongue, as it is in common parlance, a word which stands both for the race and for any individual of it? She says not. In one of her publications she declares that when she uses the term *man* she means by it just what a certain Methodist bishop meant when he said in a lecture, "Nobody has ever seen man." And yet, as will be seen, she finds herself unable to maintain this distinction between the race, which, in its totality, no man has ever seen or can see, and the individual man; and her statements as to man are liable to be misunderstood on almost every page of her writings by being received as referring to individual men. But when her words are carefully weighed, it is found that she means to teach that the race is *one great universal being*, and that she purposely avoids every term which might imply that what she says of man is true of all *men*.

The following are some of her statements concerning man:

It should be well understood that all men have one Mind, one God and Father, one Life, Truth and Love. Mankind will become perfect in proportion as this becomes apparent, and the true brotherhood of Man will thus be established. Having no other gods, turning to no other mind but the one perfect Intelligence to guide him, Man is the likeness of God, pure and eternal, having that Mind which was also in Christ. —*Science and Health*, p. 463.

Man was and is God's idea, even the infinite expression of Infinite Mind, and co-existent and co-eternal with that Mind. Man has been forever in the eternal Mind, God. . . Man's consciousness and individuality are reflections of God . . . the emanations of Him who is Life, Truth and Love.—*Ibid.*, p. 231.

Man is . . . the compound idea of God, including all right ideas; the generic term for all that reflects God's image and likeness; the conscious identity of Being, as found in Science, where Man is the reflection of God, or Mind, and therefore is eternal; that which has no separate Mind from God.—*Ibid.*, p. 471.

These statements exemplify again the utter worthlessness of Mrs. Eddy's disclaimer as to Pantheism. It is impossible for her words to be understood in any other than a pantheistic sense. Man is, she says, not God himself, but only his eternal idea. But, nevertheless, Man has no separate mind from God. His intelligence is none other than the Divine intelligence. In him resides the "conscious identity of Being." That is, the only consciousness which God has of his own identity is found in the consciousness of man. In such statements she holds out to her followers the intoxicating thought that they themselves are not merely temples of the Holy One, but that all their

thoughts are, in fact, God's thoughts, and that the only soul which anybody has is God himself. He is the Ego: that which says, "I" or "Us" in every human being is nothing less than the Spirit of the Eternal, conscious of its own identity.

How this doctrine affects some people, we may learn from Mrs. Woodbury:

> On all hands are victims believing themselves to be 'as gods.' Estrangement in families, discords in the home circle, bitter alienations from pastors and churches, are inevitable results from such mal-teaching and mal-practice, while cases of ensuing insanity are not rare.—*Christian Science Voices,* p. 142.

It is true that Mrs. Woodbury is here speaking, not of Christian Science as she then understood it, and as she supposed Mrs. Eddy to teach it, but of certain other "ambitious teachers of the people, deluded by egotism and flattery from their blind followers," whom she represents as engaged in the work of disseminating "spurious adulterations of Christian healing." But such doctrine as that just now quoted from Mrs. Eddy herself is precisely adapted to induce insanity and all the other difficulties named, simply because of its tendency to make people count themselves "as gods." Let any man become possessed with this thought, "My intelligence is God's intelligence, my consciousness is his," and he will speedily conclude that his thoughts are in fact God's thoughts, and that in all his life he is acting and speaking by divine inspiration. Is not the man who is laboring under such a delusion already fit for the insane asylum? [1]

[1] Since the above was written a friend writes me that quite recently there was in the State Hospital for the Insane at

Mrs. Eddy, however, would have us keep ourselves humble; and hence this bit of sublimated idealism and "scientific" humility, "Think of thyself as the orange just eaten, of which only the pleasant idea is left."—*Science and Health*, p. 277.

Just why, we are not told, unless it be because Man is not substantial, but only an idea! This is predicating a very shadowy existence, indeed, for that exalted being of whom we have been told that in him resides the "conscious identity" of God!

At this point, we notice another of the many absurdities of our "scientific" reasoner. The Scriptures tell us (Romans viii. 9, and sundry other passages) that God dwells in his children. This, however, is one of the texts quoted by her, without any attempt to explain or translate it into the "new tongue" of Christian Science. Having defined man as God's idea, she is driven to keep up somehow the distinction between God and his own thoughts. Hence the follow-

---

Morganton, N. C., a patient whose trouble was caused by becoming a convert to Christian Science, and sends me the following, clipped from the *Philadelphia Medical Record* of March 4, 1899:

"*Indignity to a Christian Scientist.*—A Christian Science healer was recently committed in a police court here for examination as to her sanity because she expressed the conviction that Mrs. Eddy, the plutocratic founder of the delusion, was God. As Mrs. Eddy claims to have cured caries, tuberculosis, cancer, 'tuberculous diphtheria,' and a host of other trifling ailments of the sort, by just thinking, it seems natural enough for anybody who believes her to believe also that she is the Supreme Being. The healer just committed is no more insane than her associates; she is only more logical."

ing remarkable denial of the doctrine of God's immanence in his creation: "God is the only Life, and life is no more in the forms which express it than Substance is in its shadow."—*Science and Health,* p. 226.

Again:

> Man reflects and expresses the Divine Substance or Mind; but God is not in his reflection any more than man is in the mirror which reflects his image, or the sun is in the ray of light which goes out from it.—*Ibid.,* pp. 196-'7.

Her reasons for this denial are quite logical and conclusive. First, "If Life were in mortal man or in material things, it would be subject to their limitations and end in death."—*Ibid.,* p. 226. How Life, which she regards as the only reality, could end in death, which she counts an unreality, she does not pause to explain. Second, "If he dwelt within what he creates, God would not be reflected, but absorbed," etc.—*Ibid.,* p. 226.

Her reason, it appears, for denying a very plain scripture, which she cannot by any possibility reconcile with her philosophy, is simply to avoid cataclysms and take care of the universe. A dead God, or one to whom his universe has become a fatal sponge to absorb or digest him, must not be tolerated in our thinking! We confess that quite as much as Mrs. Eddy herself do we repel all the "glittering audacity of diabolical and sinuous logic"[1] that would lead to such horrible conclusions. For this wondrously wise *reductio ad absurdum*—a feat of inspired intellect which, we venture to assert, is without a parallel in the writings of Paul, of Bacon, of Berkeley,

[1] *Unity of Good,* p. 68.

or even of Mother Goose—Mrs. Eddy deserves the gratitude of the race she came to save.

Having shown us conclusively that God cannot be in his creation, it is quite as easy for Mrs. Eddy to show us that the scriptural account of the creation is all wrong. To this position her system forces her. If Man is, and always was, God's idea, it follows that he was never created. If we devise any theory, upon the basis of her teaching, that gives to the race a beginning, we fall into other cataclysms that are too horrible to contemplate. One is, that if man, God's only idea, ever had a beginning, then prior to that beginning God had no ideas! Who could believe in an empty-headed, idiotic sort of a god, without ideas? Again, since man's being is God's only identity, if there was ever a time when Man did not exist, God at that time had no identity! Further, since in Man resides God's consciousness, if Man were ever created, prior to that creation God was unconscious! Still again, if God had ideas he must have expressed them, in order to maintain his own existence; " for," says our oracle, speaking with her usual lucidity, "God without the image and likeness of himself would be a nonentity, or Mind unexpressed." From all which reasoning it follows conclusively that if the Bible or any other book gives an account of the creation of man, that account must be dismissed as mythical. Mrs. Eddy, being inspired beyond the prophets of the "Jewish tribal God, Jehovah," can make no such mistakes as did Moses and his successors.

Seeking to explain the biblical account of creation, so as to compel it to harmonize with her teaching as to the eternity of man, Mrs. Eddy takes advanced ground in a way well adapted to abash the whole

world of "traditional theologians." She is not satisfied to interpret scripture by reversing its propositions, or even by substituting, in certain passages, for the word which denies her precious doctrines, another which affirms it. When she comes to speak of creation, she makes a dexterous movement, in keeping with the Napoleonic character of her genius, and puts herself in the very vanguard of the Higher Criticism. She discovers in the "latest conclusions" of "modern scholarship" abundant verifications of her teaching! In fact, she captures the whole camp of the critics, and appears, as it were, in triumphal procession, dragging Drs. Driver, Cheyne, Briggs, *et id omne genus,* captive in her train! And, with the conceded right of conquest, she proceeds to make such use of their stock in trade as suits the exigencies of her argument.

These infallible critics are all agreed that, notwithstanding the fact, which they claim to have verified, that the account of creation, as given in Genesis, is a patchwork story made by dove-tailing two narratives together, there is truth in each story, whether it be considered mythical, poetical, or what not. But to Mrs. Eddy there is no beauty in one of them that she should admire it. She regards the first chapter of Genesis as all true and inspired, and also the first five verses of the second. But the story of Eden and the fall she finds all wrong, and all else connected with it. This second chapter of Genesis gives us, she has discovered, "a material view of God and the universe which is the exact opposite of scientific truth." It "chronicles man as mutable and mortal—as having broken away from Deity, and as revolving in an orbit of his own." This cannot be, since "existence, separate from Deity, is impossible." It is also panthe-

istic, teaching that "Spirit coöperated with matter in creating man," which, of course, is false! Besides, it it contradictory of the first, etc. Hence her efforts to explain this portion of the Bible are mainly efforts to show its falsity, and yet she seeks to make it at the same time a sort of allegory, teaching her doctrine. We give one specimen of her reasoning in the premises: "Is Spirit, God, injected into dust, and eventually ejected at the demand of matter? Does Spirit enter into dust, and lose therein the Divine nature and omnipotence?"—*Science and Health,* pp. 515, 517.

Aside from the necessity of so explaining the Bible as to make it support her peculiar view of the dignity of man, as "God's eternal idea," there is another reason for the wrath in this celestial mind, burning, as it does, with steady glow, against the biblical account of man's creation and fall. That account of the origin of woman does not suit her. She has been commissioned to teach the world that "woman is the highest species of Man," and she can in no wise admit the truth of a story which makes woman's subjection to man a part of the creative plan, and a fundamental law of human society. Accordingly, she indulges a scorn quite Ingersollian in her remarks upon the ancient myth, which she would fain effectually explode. In commenting on Genesis ii. 21, she says: "Falsity, error, charges Truth, God, with inducing a *hypnotic state* in Adam, in order to *perform a surgical operation* on him, and thereby create a woman."—*Ibid.,* p. 521. Following this refined and delicate piece of wit, she makes some jocular remarks upon surgery and obstetrics, as illustrated in this story of creation.

But where did the various orders of created things come from? Mrs. Eddy answers: "Beholding

the creations of his own dream, and calling them real and God-given, Adam—*alias* error—gives them names. Afterwards, he becomes the basis of the creation of woman and of his own kind, calling them mankind."—*Science and Health,* p. 521.

This is a marvelous account of creation. God was not the Creator of the visible universe! Adam dreamed, and the objects first seen in his vision became the supposed realities of his waking hours! He errs in calling them real and God-given! Not even the sun and the moon, as we have seen, are to be considered as real things, but as subjective states of human thought; and so likewise, "*vertebrata, articulata, mollusca* and *radiata,* are evolved by mortal and material thought."—*Ibid.,* p. 548.

Mrs. Eddy, in teaching that the real cause of all material things beside himself was the dream of Adam, comes perilously near the absurdities of Mormonism, and, following the parabolic curve of her genius, goes beyond them. The Mormon hierarchy declares, with Brigham Young, that Adam is "the only God with whom we have to do, and that he helped to make and organize the world." According to Mrs. Eddy, Adam imagined it all, and all that now exists is but the outcome of his imagination, the work of which has been perhaps supplemented by the creative fancies of successive generations.

But who was Adam, and how did he come into being? The reader of Mrs. Eddy's works will search in vain for a clear and unambiguous answer to this question. Having forsaken the teachings of God's own Book, she wanders in a fog whenever she touches the relation of the race to Adam, or Adam's relation to God. Her definition of the name Adam, in her

glossary, which pretends to give the "spiritual sense" and also the "original meaning" of the terms therein defined, is the longest definition in the whole chapter. Evidently, Adam is a refractory subject. Abel's spiritual significance is explained "scientifically" in two lines, and Abraham's in five; but she labors through a whole page in trying to explain Adam! She defines him as meaning—

> Error; a falsity; the belief in original sin, sickness and death; evil; the opposite of Good, or God, and his creation; a curse; a belief in intelligent matter, finiteness and mortality; "dust to dust"; red sandstone; the first god of mythology; not God's man, who represents the one God, and is his own image and likeness; the opposite of Spirit and its creations; that which is not the image and likeness of Good, but a material belief opposed to the one Mind, or Spirit; a so-called finite mind, producing other minds, thus making "gods many and lords many" (1 Cor. viii. 5); an unreality, as opposed to the great reality of spiritual existence and creation; a so-called man, whose origin, substance and mind are supposed to be the opposite of God, or Spirit; an inverted image of Spirit; the image and likeness of God's opposites—namely, matter, sin, sickness and death; the antipodes of Truth, termed error; the counterfeit of Life, which ultimates in death; the opposite of Love, called hate; the antipodes of Spirit's creation, called self-creative matter; Immortality's opposite, mortality; that of which Wisdom saith, "Thou shalt surely die;" . . . the false supposition that Life is not eternal, but has beginning and end; that the Infinite enters the finite, Intelligence passes into non-intelligence, and Soul dwells in material sense; that Immortal Mind results in matter, and matter in mortal mind; that the one God and Creator entered what he created, and then disappeared in the atheism of matter.—*Science and Health,* pp. 570-'1.

This definition is a tremendous effort to get Adam out of the way. He is now a myth, and anon a myth-

ological god; dust and red sandstone; a false belief, which, on examination, is found to be simply a denial of Mrs. Eddy's infallibility; evil, which, as we shall see in a subsequent part of our examination, is the devil; nor can it escape her shrewd intellect that in making the visible universe the creation of Adam's dream, she has, in her definition of Adam, made the devil the father of us all in very truth! This is true, in her opinion, if we do not agree with her! Adam is also an unreality, a "so-called man;" an "inverted image" of God, whatever that may mean; and, in a word, the "false supposition" that Christian Science is not a true gospel and an infallible revelation! And yet we cannot fail to see that Mrs. Eddy's labored, tautological and self-contradictory definition is unsatisfactory to herself, as it must appear nonsensical to the "unscientific" reader. Why does she speak of him, a "so-called man," as being *supposed* to be the opposite of God, when she has plainly declared him to be the "antipodes" of Truth, which is one of her terms for the Divine Being? As nobody but herself ever imagined the unfallen Adam to be opposed to God, we can only understand from her confusion here that she has her own doubts as to her truthfulness in attempting what she so happily terms her "feeble revelation."

Having exploded Adam—blowing him to the four winds with a definition of the most fulminating character—Mrs. Eddy must needs provide a first man. If Adam was not the first man, who was? We have seen her answer to this question. It was Jesus in a previous state of existence. This she learns from his statement that he existed before Abraham, and having the universe at her disposal, she chooses to locate him

on this planet. Just where and when he lived, what he did, besides antidoting the ills of the flesh, and whether he was a cotemporary of Adam or not, she has not informed us; nor, since she has finished her "feeble revelation," is there any reasonable probability that she ever will. It is a passing pity that the only person in the world who possesses all this information should "disappear" without enlightening our ignorance. Adam was evil, a nonentity, and a myth; but Jesus was the real primordial man. Did he marry some unchronicled Eve, and die childless? Or did he share with Adam, that supposed man, in some way the paternity of the race? Are there two human races—one, that of enlightened spirits, or Scientists, sprung from Jesus in his first incarnation, and the other of common mortals, sprung from Adam, the evil, or devil? Or did Jesus live and die unmarried, achieving among the antediluvian mortals great reputation as a Science healer? These are important questions. Having told us so much, Mrs. Eddy ought to have told us more. She knows, having no mind but God, and being thus able to command the treasures of Omniscience.

In this connection, the remarks of our new infallibility upon the name of Adam are interesting: "Adam is from the Hebrew *adamah,* signifying the red color of the ground, dust, nothingness."—*Science and Health,* p. 223.

This will surprise Hebraists of all calibres. The following, too, is another "ray of infinite Truth," as perceived by our new prophetess, and is luminosity itself:

> Divide the name Adam into two syllables, and it reads *a dam,* or obstruction. This suggests the thought of something

fluid, or mortal mind mixed in solution, of the darkness which seemed to appear when "darkness was upon the face of the deep" and matter stood as opposed to Spirit, as that which was accursed. Jehovah declared the ground—matter or earth—accursed, and from this earth or matter sprang Adam, although God had blessed the earth for man's sake.—*Ibid.*, p. 233.

But really, does not this division of Adam's name suggest rather the thought of *a weak brain,* laboring under the burden of infinite absurdity? of a "mortal mind" befogged with its own irrational theories? of the darkness which abides in the soul when the light of reason and of scriptural truth has been shut out, and a silly woman opposes her stupid vaporings to the plain utterances of the Divine Spirit? At any rate Mrs. Eddy's feat in cutting Adam's name in two is profoundly suggestive of her ability and originality as an expounder of scripture. Not to look farther, we find a startling proof that she possesses

> "Optics keen,
> To see what is not to be seen"

in the inference which she deduces from her discussion and division of Adam's name: "From this it follows that Adam was not the ideal man for whom the earth was blessed. The ideal man was revealed in due time, and known as Jesus the Christ."—*Ibid.*, p. 233.

This is all we can gather from the new word of God as to the creation of Adam. He sprang out of the earth somehow, notwithstanding God had blessed it for man's sake; and the fact that Adam sprang out of the ground is proof positive that he was not the ideal man, the "man of God's creating."

It is to be regretted that Mrs. Eddy does not tell us—it would have been so easy for one so richly inspired to do so—how Adam got into the ground before he sprang out of it, and where he was and what he was doing before he got into the ground. As she has not condescended to give us this important information, we are left to our own inferences. Adam, as we have seen, means nothingness; and the ground, being matter, is unreality or nothingness. So we see very plainly that the scriptural account of creation, as it opens under the light of "Science," means that nothingness got into nothingness, and then—we can readily imagine how easy it was—"sprang out of" it! And it has been ever since springing out of itself and bamboozling its descendants, who are the people that will not believe in Mrs. Eddy!

But how came Man, the infinite idea of the infinite God, perfect, co-existent and co-eternal with God, to be associated with Adam, that embodied falsity? Whence came "mortal mind" and all its train of illusions, such as the dream of human personality, the five senses, and the rest? We have in vain searched the pages of this new and only infallible revelation for any answer to these questions. The only clue to Mrs. Eddy's views we can find is in her scattered remarks upon man and mortals. In our common parlance, to which all respectable writers conform, these terms are synonymous. But she has invented a "new tongue," which is an entirely original method of spiritualizing, contradicting, dividing, allegorizing, or otherwise distorting plain Scripture, to make it bear some semblance of agreement with her doctrines. Hence, the need of a glossary, that the reader may understand passages in which she uses old words in

a new sense. According to her vocabulary, Man stands for the spiritual man, the Idea of God, while the terms, *mortal, mankind,* and *human,* all stand for the illusory and transient phases of our life. Here is her account of "mortals":

> Mortals will disappear, and immortals, or the children of God, will appear as the only and eternal verities of Man. Mortals are not fallen children of God. They never had a perfect state of being which may be regained. They were, from the beginning of human history, conceived in sin and brought forth in iniquity. Mortals are material falsities, . . . "without hope and without God in the world," . . . errors, made up of sin, sickness, and death, which must disappear, to give place to the facts which belong to immortal man.—*Science and Health,* p. 472.
>
> . . . Mortals have a very feeble and imperfect idea of the spiritual man and the infinite range of his thought. To him belongs eternal life. Never born and never dying, it is an impossibility for Being, under the government of eternal Science, to fall from its high estate.—*Ibid.,* p. 154.

And still more specifically:

> Man represents God; mankind represents the Adamic race, and is a human, not a Divine creation. . . . The senses represent Man as having untimely birth, and his death as irresistible, as if he were a weed growing apace, or a flower withered by the sun, or nipped by untimely frosts. But this is true only of mortals, not man. The Truth of Being is perennial.—*Ibid.,* pp. 518, 161.

More pantheism. The Scriptures, which represent man as being born and as destined to untimely death, etc., are wrong, because man is God! "The senses" give this testimony as to the race, but their testimony is false, because the Truth of Being, which is God, is perennial.

Man, then, we must understand, is not to be confounded with the Adamic race. The former is spiritual and perfect; the latter is an embodied falsity, a mass of sin, sickness, and death. The former is never born and never dies, being co-existent and co-eternal with God; the latter are brought forth in sin, and destined every one to pass through the "belief of death," to "disappear," and so "give place to the eternal verities which belong to immortal man." And yet in all Mrs. Eddy has to say about the creation and the fall, she has not one plain word in regard to the origin of "mortal sense," with all its train of woe. The fall she represents as a myth, and "mortal sense" is smuggled into her scheme, so far as I can find, without so much as a word of introduction.

There are profound mysteries in this "Divine Science." It is, however, a significant fact that in six of the points named in her definitions of Adam and mortal sense, she states the same things of both. Hence we may conclude, in view of her denial of the identity of the Adamic race with man, that she considers "Adam" and "mortal sense" identical. She cannot be accused of running "mortal sense" into the ground. She simply gets it out of the ground when she gets Adam out, without pretending to show how it, any more than Adam, got there!

The distinction between Man and mankind which Mrs. Eddy has revealed, involves necessarily the denial of the doctrine of human personality. Man she has defined as the infinite idea of the infinite God. Being only an idea, he can hardly be spoken of as a person. Further, if man is an infinite idea, as she contends, it follows that if he is a person, he must be an infinite person; and God being infinite, we would then

have two infinite persons, which cannot be. Mrs. Eddy holds to "a sweet and sacred sense of Man's unity with his Maker," and she cannot admit any view of human personality that would contradict what she has already said of the divine personality, of which, it will be remembered, she is so doubtful. In all her scattered remarks upon this question, her thought is muddy as the Tiber. She never anywhere gets away from the notion that personality, as commonly understood, means a personality that is confined within the body. Hence she rejects the idea of personality as applied to God, as anthropomorphism, or "a humanization of deity." And since the race, as a whole, cannot be confined within the limits of any particular body, she denies personality to the race.

But in this denial, she fails, as we have shown, to get hold of the true meaning of personality. This attribute of man, which is predicable of every individual of the race, implies individual existence, self-consciousness, reason, and moral agency, or freedom of will. It is a spiritual, and not a physical attribute. Death cannot destroy it. The body changes in all its constituent atoms every few years, and at death returns to its mother earth. But the spirit, which is the personal man, lives on. This doctrine Mrs. Eddy repudiates expressly by denying that human beings have individual souls. In answering the question, What are body and soul? she informs us oracularly that "identity is the reflection of Spirit in multifarious forms of this living Principle;" and that "Soul," which in her terminology is but another name for the divine Being, "is the Substance, Life, and Intelligence of Man."[1] She has defined Man as that which has

[1] *Science and Health*, p. 473.

no separate Mind from God. To admit his real personality, as one "revolving in an orbit of his own," would be to admit that he is somehow so independent of his Maker as to have no relations with him whatever. More than one mind would mean, to her, more than one God, since she defines God as Mind. Hence she solemnly waives aside the notion with oracular and sententious brevity: "Verily, I say unto you, God is All-in-All, and you can never be outside of his oneness."

Elsewhere she seems to admit that human personality is a real fact to be reckoned with in our mortal career. On page 8 of *Rudiments and Rules,* we read:

> The human person is finite, and, therefore, I prefer to retain a proper sense of deity by using the phrase an *individual* God, rather than a personal God; for there can be but one infinite individual Being, whom mortals have named God.

But in *Science and Health* she says we "run into error when we divide Soul into souls, and multiply Mind into minds." So there is, after all, no such thing as a human personality. "Upon this stage of existence goes on the dance of mortal mind," in which "mortal thoughts chase each other like snowflakes" (p. 146); but the "mortal thought of personality" is at variance with the only true and "scientific statement" of the fact. Still again, she tells us that "personality includes *more* than is implied by the term person as commonly used." What then? Without giving any very definite reply to this question, she informs us that Christ was crucified because his enemies were incensed by his "truly Christian and scien-

[1] *Science and Health,* p. 259.

tific statement of personality and the relation of Man to God."[1] From this we can only infer that the statement in question was our Lord's answer to the high priest's inquiry, "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" *Man's only true personality consists, then, in being, or in becoming, in precisely the same sense that Christ is, the Son of God.* If "the word Christ is not properly a synonym for Jesus," and if Christ "expresses God's spiritual and eternal idea,"[2] which idea, as we have seen, is Man, does not this mean that man's destiny—the destiny, that is, of the whole race—is to become all that Christ now is? "When his personality disappears, man is immortal. Who can say what his personality becomes as the image and likeness of his Maker?" And if we are in doubt as to the answer she would give to the question, we may permit her spokesman, Mr. Bailey, to answer for us:

> The New Testament declares, and *Science and Health* demonstrates, that the Principle of Jesus—in other words, the Christ—is the name for that state of consciousness which is the goal, the inevitable, ultimate state of every soul.

This is her universalism. All are saved by being at last absorbed into the "Christ-Principle." But we are still in the dark. What does Mrs. Eddy mean by human personality in this life? In the absence of any clear definition by herself, perhaps the following from her pupil, Mr. Mason, may be accepted as a definition of human personality, according to Mrs. Eddy: "The so-called material man is an incorporate belief of carnality, and the dissolution of the component parts

---

[1] *Science and Health*, p. 259. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 228.

or beliefs which constitute him we term death."—*Seed*, April 1, 1890.

Man, if we are able to comprehend this mysterious doctrine, is an infinite creature, composed of a divine idea or consciousness, which is common to all the individuals of the race, united to an indefinite number of "incorporate beliefs of carnality." At death or subsequently these incorporate beliefs, or personalities, will all disappear, and nothing else will be left but the impersonal, eternal idea which has existed from the beginning. Human personality, then, like all other facts of consciousness, as viewed in this peculiar system, is illusory and transient. Man is, in the distant future, to become identified with the Christ-Principle, and all the individuals of whom the race was composed will have "disappeared" when the "man of God's creating" shall have been revealed. Thus do we find the doctrines of human individuality and of personal immortality both distinctly denied.

Having denied the fall, repudiated the doctrine of human personality, and declared that man's mind is one with the divine intelligence, Mrs. Eddy is also compelled to deny that human beings are accountable to God. Mankind, indeed, is sinful, as she seems to admit; but Man, she insists, is not to be confounded with the Adamic race. Besides, sin itself is not a fact in the universe, but an illusion, or false sense, which is destined to be lost or to disappear. This disappearance, or destruction of sin, is at once hell and heaven; since the destruction of sin is God's only method of either pardon or punishment, and the loss of the sense of sin restores the sinner to "harmony," which is heaven. Now, it is evident that no amount of argument, and no repetitions, however multitu-

dinous, of the text, "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap," can prevent such doctrines from effecting in those who accept them a complete deliverance from all the wholesome fears wrought by the old doctrine of human accountability, with its corollaries of future reward and retribution.

But, lest her disciples should fail to follow her doctrines into their logical consequences, she enters against the doctrine of human accountability a most positive denial. She is even driven to adopt the threadbare arguments of infidelity, in order to give to the shadowy fancies of her crazy creed some semblance of reasonableness. Infidels have argued that God would not and could not make man capable of sin, and then damn him for sinning. She, in like manner, argues that this would be to perpetuate a "fraud on humanity." "In common justice," she cries, "we must admit that God will not punish man for doing what he created him capable of doing, and knew from the outset that he would do." (*Science and Health,* p. 302.) Just why she should go to the trouble of denying human accountability in such explicit terms, when she has already denied the reality of sin, we cannot imagine.

But it may be asked, How does Mrs. Eddy reconcile her denial of personal immortality, etc., with the plain teachings of our Lord? He said, "Fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Her interpretation of this passage, which was undeniably the product of her most careful study, is a striking instance of her facility in cutting Gordian knots of difficulty when they stand in the way of her theories. This is her explanation of our Lord's meaning:

A careful study of the text shows that the word *soul* meant *sense* or *corporeal consciousness.* The command was a warning to beware, not of Rome, Satan, or God, but of sin. —*Science and Health,* p. 92.

From this brilliant example it is evident that Mrs. Eddy's powers of discernment are equal to any emergency.

But, after all, this warning was not sufficiently terrible to justify a sinner in trembling as he reads it. This we may see from the following:

In Science we learn that it is material sense, not Soul, which sins; and it will be found that it is the sense of sin which is lost, and not man's sinful soul. When reading the Scriptures, the substitution of the word *sense* for soul gives the exact meaning in a majority of cases.—*Ibid.,* p. 477.

"All sin is of the flesh," she has told us elsewhere; "it cannot be spiritual." Flesh, being matter, is an unreality, and sin, being of the flesh, is an unreality; and hence the salvation promised in Holy Writ, and for which Jesus seemed to die that it might be ours, is nothing but salvation from unrealities. "The real Man cannot depart from holiness," nor can God, "by whom Man was evolved, engender the capacity or freedom to sin." True, there are sinners, but these are not, properly speaking, men. "Mortals are man's counterfeits . . . the children of the Wicked One, or one evil, which declares that man begins as a material embryo." (*Ibid.,* pp. 207, 471.) Moreover, all men, though now classed as mortals, if not sufficiently enlightened to accept Mrs. Eddy's guidance, are notwithstanding destined to pass through the "gateway of Science" into the royal estate of manhood, which is Christhood.

We would, however, do Mrs. Eddy the justice to say that in her treatment of sin, her practice ignores her logic quite as much as it does in the matter of eating. She counts sin an "awful unreality." But if it be an unreality, why not treat it as all other beliefs of mortal mind are treated in the Christian Science medical practice—that is, as a mere illusion, which is to be destroyed simply by refusing to admit its reality? "Healing the sick and reforming the sinner are one and the same thing in Christian Science," says this "Mental Messiah." (*Science and Health,* p. 403.) If, then, it be truly "scientific" to say to an invalid, Your sickness exists only in your belief; correct your thought by denying the evidence of your senses—why not say to the conscience-stricken sufferer from "chronic sin," Your sin is only a belief of mortal mind, a figment of your imagination; you have done no wrong, and your regrets are needless? If we may deny the plain sense of Scripture and the testimony of our senses in the one case, why may we not deny, with equal propriety, the testimony of Scripture and of our own consciences in the other?

Much that Mrs. Eddy and her followers have written has seemed to imply that no sinner needs to pay any attention to his conscience, and that "Christian Science" repentance consists simply in blinding one's self to one's own sins. Thus the "Word of Science" declares that—

> These beliefs of sin, sickness and death are only beliefs; they are not realities of Being; God is Love, and he has not bound on you these burdens; you are not the hateful beings you believe; you were made in, and you are, the image and likeness of God.—*Christian Science Series,* No. 6, p. 4.

Again, we are told repeatedly that Man is perfect; that "Soul cannot sin," that "Man is incapable of sin, sickness or death," and we might infer that all repentance is needless. (*Science and Health*, p. 464.) But for all that, Mrs. Eddy and her school will not use, in their treatment of sin, the method which they have so clearly indicated, and which they consistently apply in their treatment of disease. They dare not assure the sinner that his conscience is a lying witness, and that he must banish all thought and memory of his own guilt, and stoutly affirm, *I have not sinned!* Two difficulties lie in the way of such a course, consistent as it must appear to all who believe her teachings. One is that both the general tenor and many particular passages of Scripture plainly estop any such proceeding. Paul and John, not to mention other apostles, and even our Lord himself, have spoken so plainly that their testimony must be accepted, or else the whole Scripture must be thrown overboard. Paul (Romans iii. 23) declares that all men have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; while John goes so far as to say, "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us," and also, "If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us." Such declarations from a book which "Science" requires us to accept as of equal authority even with Mrs. Eddy's "feeble revelation," cannot be waived aside. Mrs. Eddy does not hesitate, when she is discussing other points of doctrine, to misapply, explain away, or even deny, the authority of Scripture; but in this case the contradiction would be too bald, and the probable result a revolt in her camp. The other difficulty is, that in reforming sinners she

can hardly expect to succeed by telling them no reformation is necessary. It is quite pleasing to her fancy to view Man—the vague, general, impersonal Man, conceived of as the abstract, Divine, Archetypal Idea —as perfect, sinless, and incapable of sin, but nevertheless, as we have seen, she affirms that all mortals are sinners. She cannot be blind to the facts, and does not pretend to deny them.

Accordingly, she advises quite a different method of dealing with sin. She would have her students never so much as audibly name diseases, lest the very naming of them should prove a creative power to produce such "erroneous beliefs;" but "lust, hatred and dishonesty," however unreal, are not to be considered such unrealities that they may be dismissed by denial, like the "false claims" of headache. (*Science and Health,* p. 403.) She must, perforce, uphold the Bible, declaim against sin as an evil, and preach up the duty of holiness. Sins she counts errors, but she manifestly uses the word in this connection in a different sense from that in which she is wont to use it in discussing physical maladies. The latter she has defined as errors in the sense of being illusions, mere spectres conjured up by "mortal mind." Sinful passions and propensities she seems to consider errors in the sense of being mistakes of judgment, and as promising falsely—which is correct. Nobody denies that sin is a fearful mistake and a dreadful delusion. Hence, her treatment of sin is so far almost orthodox. Witness the following:

> The heat of hatred, inflaming brutal propensities, the indulgence of evil motives and aims, will make any man who is above the lowest type of manhood a hopeless sufferer. . . . Christian Science commands man to master these

propensities—to hold hatred in abeyance with kindness, to conquer revenge with charity, and to overcome deceit with honesty. . . Choke these errors in their early stages, if you would not cherish an army of conspirators against health, happiness and success. . . . "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." . . . You had better be exposed to every plague on earth than to endure the cumulative effects of a guilty conscience. The abiding consciousness of wrong-doing tends to destroy the ability to do right.—*Science and Health,* p. 403.

Thus we see, that while denying the reality of sin in general, she is forced to admit the existence of sinful appetites, propensities and deeds in particular; and that she would have these destroyed, not like disease, by the mere mastery of "Mind" over mortal sense, but from first to last by being "regretted," struggled against and conquered.

But the trail of the serpent is in her doctrine of sin, and Mrs. Eddy does not succeed in neutralizing the poisonous slime by covering it with orthodox phrases. She holds that sin is an unreality, and her followers are compelled to regard it as a mere delusion. She maintains that God "is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity," and explains this to mean that God cannot be conscious of any evil in his universe. "Doth God know, and is there knowledge with the Most High?" is a question to which she returns, in all her discussion of sin, an emphatic negative. The God of the Bible, to whom she refers respectfully as "the Jewish tribal God, Jehovah," is a God who hates and abominates sin; but Mrs. Eddy's God, abiding in a passionless calm, is unconscious of evil and of sin. He is incapable of displeasure, and his wrath, Paul to the contrary, is never visited upon the children of

disobedience. He has not appointed any day in which he will judge the world by that man whom he hath ordained. No; Paul was mistaken. Thus sounds the "trumpet voice of Truth": "No final judgment awaits mortals; for the judgment day of Wisdom comes hourly and continually, even the judgment by which mortal man is divested of all material error. As for spiritual error, there is none."—*Science and Health,* p. 187.

Sin is "a material error," of which mortals are being surely and inevitably divested. It does not touch the Soul, and is left behind in the march of Mind, with all other mundane illusions!

We have observed, also, that she scouts the doctrine of original sin, and makes it synonymous with "Adam, falsity, error," etc.; and then, admitting it through constraint, counts it the fictitious attribute of an imaginary "Adamic race." The key-note of her anthropology is that Man is "perfect and sinless as the Mind which created him." No amount of orthodox exhortation, no grudging and ambiguous admission of sin as an evil actually affecting the lives of men, can prevent such doctrine from being turned, by those who accept it, into practical antinomianism. Let any man consider that his thoughts are divine, and his real self sinless and incapable of sin, and it it but a step to the opinion that do what he may, he is doing right. The following is Mrs. Woodbury's testimony, as to her own experience in Christian Science teaching and healing:

> Certain manifestations were unaccountable on any rational theory. Persons whom I persuaded to try this curative system drifted into abnormal actions. Their statements, sometimes written as well as spoken, were startlingly con-

tradictory. . . . In my own "chambers of imagery" also was mental bewilderment. At one moment all seemed surely good, yet the next hour the feeling supervened that wrong was the great ruler, and that mankind might exclaim with Milton's Satan, "Evil, be thou my Good." . . .

A bulwark was needed to stem the erotic tide, favored in some quarters; and moral stamina was the more essential, because the odium of increasing divorce and domestic alienation, the land over, was often attributed to Christian Science. Certain patent domestic misfortunes among mental workers naturally brought discredit upon Christian Science and increased my strenuous advocacy of the imperative necessity of the home. . . Some essays of mine on this very subject were later rejected by the *Christian Science Journal* as not coming within its scope, etc.—*War in Heaven.*

All this is readily accounted for. Bewilderment, immorality, insanity, domestic alienation and divorce, all conspiring to "bring discredit upon Christian Science," are sufficient to indicate a state of things that would make the management of a "Scientific" periodical chary about admitting into its pages essays that would, even in sounding the alarm, publish the shame of the new "Church of Christ!" Christian Science doctrine is moral poison. The fact stated by Mrs. Woodbury in the *Arena,* May, 1899, that "Christian Science families are notably childless," is just what we would expect.

Mrs. Eddy and her followers may insist as much as they please that sin must inevitably produce suffering; but she has blunted the force of all such orthodox warnings by her own invariable proviso that sin and suffering are both unrealities. Her doctrine delivers its adherents from all sense of accountability, and breeds an egoistic perfectionism that is close akin to madness.

But she and her school, being sure that her interpretations of Scripture are the only ones which give the "spiritual sense," are unable to see the reason of their own spiritual impotence. Her own words sound like an unconscious prophecy of her disastrous failure to reform the world: "Take away the spiritual signification of Scripture, and that compilation can do no more for mortals than moonbeams to melt a river of ice."—*Science and Health*, p. 137.

We need not pause to inquire particularly what our oracle teaches as to the new birth. She has made it plain that Man does not need it, and that "mortals" attain it only at their last death. Then, and not till then, do they forever "put off false individuality," by ceasing to exist as personal beings.

Little need has Christian Science of atonement. Man is no sinner, and there is no pardon for the transgressions of mortals. "In trying to undo the errors of sense one must pay, here or hereafter, the utmost farthing, until the body is fully brought into subjection to the Spirit." The divine method of paying sin's wages differs, in "Science," from the method indicated by Paul. It is not death that the sinner inherits; but the reward of sin simply "involves unwinding one's snarls, and learning from experience, through pangs unspeakable, how to divide between error and Truth." But inasmuch as one who professes to believe the Bible must believe in an atonement of some sort, she makes the sinner's "at-one-ment" consist in a "true sense of Love," or "unity with God," *i. e.*, deification.—*Ibid.*, pp. 136, 137, 324.

In leaving this part of our subject, we may glance at the Christian Science doctrine as to unembodied spirits. The existence of personal angels and devils

Mrs. Eddy dismisses unceremoniously. Having refused to allow us to think of men as persons, she cannot, of course, admit the existence of any hierarchy of spirits, either in heaven or hell. Accordingly she gives this impressive and beautiful account of angels:

> Angels are not etherealized human beings, evolving animal qualities in their wings; but they are celestial visitants, flying on spiritual, not material pinions. They are pure thoughts from God, winged with Truth and Love, no matter what their individualism may be. Human conjecture confers upon them its own forms of thought, making them human creatures with suggestive pinions; but this is only fancy. . . .
>
> My angels are exalted thoughts, appearing at the door of some sepulchre, where human belief has buried its fondest earthly hopes. With white fingers they point upward to a new and glorified trust, a higher ideal of Life and its joys. Angels are God's impartations to man—not messengers, or persons, but *messages* of the true idea of divinity flowing into humanity. These upward-soaring thoughts never lead mortals toward self or sin, but guide them to the Principle of all Good, whither every pure and uplifting aspiration tends.—*Science and Health,* pp. 194-5.

Applying, for the purpose of eliciting its inmost meaning, one of Mrs. Eddy's own principles of interpretation to this passage, let us reverse one of its propositions, and the meaning leaps out luminously. *Her thoughts* are the "upward-soaring" angels, messages of the true idea of divinity, leading us to the Principle of Good, etc. And all other thoughts, of course, are angelic in proportion as they harmonize with hers! When the Scripture writers spoke of angels as persons and messengers, they were only inspired by human fancy—nothing more! David was in a fine frenzy of mere poetic fervor, and did not ex-

pect to be understood literally, when he wrote, "Bless the Lord, ye his angels, that excel in strength, that do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of his word!" And much Scripture must be cut out of our Bibles, if we entertain Mrs. Eddy's beautiful, white-fingered, wingless angels, that would lead us to a "new and glorified" trust in *her book* as Immanuel!

Her treatment of devils is even more summary. She simply decapitates the principal word which stands for an evil spirit, and the father of liars becomes merely abstract *Evil,* while lesser demons become *evils.* Thus does this higher and more practical Christianity deliver its adherents from all necessity of taking precautions against Satan's devices, not only denying to him and his hosts a "local habitation and a name," but annihilating the wretched hierarchy of hell. Nevertheless, Mrs. Eddy finds a devil somehow necessary in her system, and she makes use of the idea by distributing evil through the ages, and identifying it particularly with all opinions that militate against her revelation. Thus she identifies the devil in her definition of him with Adam, Eve, Canaan, Ham, Issachar, with matter and mortal mind, and more than all, with animal magnetism. As the adversary, he is all that opposes, denies and disputes reality and Truth, which is to say, Christian Science. Our Lord said, "Why do ye not understand my speech? Even because ye cannot hear my word. Ye are of your father, the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do." But in this he was explaining "the origin of material man and of mortal mind!" We do not know which to admire most in this luminous exposition—the ingenuity with which she gets rid of the devil, or

the refined wit which prompts her to retain his name as a convenient term by which to designate the paternity of all unbelievers in her "sacred discovery." And, since she has defined "evil spirits" as false beliefs, and said that these were the devils that Jesus cast out during his earthly ministry, we who refuse to acknowledge her as the Messiah for this age must be content to let ourselves be thought of by pious Scientists as devils possessed of devils!

But, notwithstanding her annihilation of the devil and all his host, Mrs. Eddy has not succeeded in delivering her followers from fear of evil. Says Mrs. Woodbury (*Arena,* May, 1899):

> Demonophobia, the fear of demons, the fear of witchcraft, is the better name for the Christian Science disease. Its advocates are crazy with the fear of a Satan of their own making, and this fear is stimulated by Mrs. Eddy's constant allusions to the subject. "If you cannot take up malicious animal magnetism," she said to one of her editors, "you can't handle my magazine." Nowhere does demonophobia thrive with such virulence as in this sect of people, who cross themselves in the name of Mary Eddy.

The stark superstition and insane fear taught and exemplified by Mrs. Eddy are almost incredible. When Mrs. Eddy's fourth husband died, the autopsy, according to the writer just quoted, showed that "death was the result of distinctly developed heart-disease; but Mrs. Eddy declared that it was the effect of arsenical poison, mentally administered" by some of her former students who had now become rivals! She claimed, it is said, that she could have healed the assassinated Garfield but for the "malicious interference" of Messrs. Kennedy and Arens, both of whom had been her pupils. But perhaps the greatest mar-

vel in the superstitions which she has taught is the doctrine she has communicated privately to her pupils, to the effect that women may not only "become mothers through a supreme effort of their own minds," but also by the influence over them of some "unholy ghost," or malign spirit; albeit, she assured them she could "dissolve such motherhood by a wave of her celestial rod." "Women of unquestionable integrity, who have been Mrs. Eddy's students, testify that she has so taught, and that by this teaching families have been broken up; that thus maidens have been terrified out of their wits, and stimulated into a frenzy resembling that of deluded French nuns, who believed themselves brought into marital relations with the glorified Jesus, as veritably the bridegroom of the church."[1] Comment is unnecessary.

[1] Mrs. Woodbury.

XVI.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE, THEOSOPHY AND GNOSTICISM.

The denial of all commonly accepted doctrines as to the future life follows necessarily upon Mrs. Eddy's denial of human personality, and her views of the final destiny of the race. Already we have scented, in her teaching as to the pre-incarnation of Jesus in the first man, the unmistakable odor of Theosophy. We have observed that she teaches Pantheism, though she stoutly denies that she is a Pantheist; and that, while she denounces hypnotism in the strongest terms as "mental mal-practice," criminal, etc., she adopts its basic principle of "suggestion" as the ground-work of her system of mental healing. When, therefore, we find her declaring that Theosophy is opposed to Christian Science, it need not surprise us to learn that a large part of her system is a plagiarism from theosophical sources, and little more to be heeded than her refusal to acknowledge her debt to Dr. Quimby. Her defense against this charge could hardly be more decisive than her defense in the matter of her mental healing theory. She did not receive her revelation until after Dr. Quimby was dead, and neither did she receive it all until after Theosophy had been brought to the attention of New Yorkers and presumably of Bostonians. The first edition of *Science and Health* was not published until 1875.

Some time before that Madame Blavatsky, the oracle of modern Theosophy, came to New York, and her society was organized in that city in 1875. Here, then, is another coincidence.

Theosophy, or the "Wisdom Religion," is the term chosen to represent their creed by certain people who have within the past thirty years undertaken to bring an emended, enlarged Buddhism to the front, and substitute it for Christianity. They have adopted the philosophy which flourished in the first ages of the Christian era among certain heathen sects in India, and, to a considerable extent, among early Christian heretics. To this they have added some gleanings from Spiritualism, and from various other religions and philosophies, with some small flavor of Christian ethics and philanthropy.

The resemblance between "Christian Science" and Theosophy is noticeable, first, in their nomenclature. It can hardly be considered a matter of accidental coincidence that so many of the terms chosen by Mrs. Eddy and her followers as the symbols of their "exalted thoughts" are identical with those adopted by Madame Blavatsky and her school. "Divine Science" is a term which the former use as synonymous with "Christian Science," while the word "Science" they use interchangeably with Wisdom. Divine Science means, therefore, Divine Wisdom, and this is simply a translation of the word Theosophy. "Embracing both the scientific and religious," says William Q. Judge, "Theosophy is a scientific religion and a religious science." In the Christ-Principle of Mrs. Eddy we recognize the "Christos Principle" of which Madame Blavatsky has somewhat to say; and both are agreed that this Christ-Principle incarnated itself in

others before it was manifested in Jesus of Nazareth. In defining God as Being, Substance, Principle, Life, Good, the Infinite, etc., Mrs. Eddy but follows in the wake of those who profess their belief in a "Universal Divine Principle." So also in Mrs. Eddy's division of Man into "mortal sense," the Christ-Principle, and the Divine Mind or Ego, all of which she considers as possessed by each of us, we recognize a crude and bungling effort to appropriate the main ideas of the "higher trinity" of Theosophy—*Manas,* the Thinker, *Buddhi,* or the Christos Principle, and *Atman,* the Supreme Ego. To this last Madame Blavatsky gives the further names of the "Universal Life," the "One Self," and the "Higher Self;" and Mrs. Eddy, after defining "I, or Ego," as "Principle, Spirit, Soul, incorporeal, unerring, immortal, and eternal Mind," goes on to say, "There is but one I, or Us, but one Principle, or Mind, governing all existence," etc.

Mrs. Eddy, having thus adopted a number of the terms in which this Oriental philosophy is paraded, has been followed by other teachers of Mental Science healing in the use of such terms as the following, all of which are borrowed from the same source:

Gnosis is the spiritual understanding, which is defined by Madame Blavatsky as knowledge, and as applying to "the spiritual and sacred knowledge, the *gupta-vidya* of the Hindus." *Yoga* is simply concentration of thought, in Mental Science teaching, while Madame Blavatsky applies it to the philosophy of "Yajnavalyah, a famous and very ancient sage." *Karma* is the law of cause and effect in Mental Science literature, and has the same meaning in Madame Blavatsky's works. *Maya* is used by Mental Scientists as meaning illusion, "mortal mind," and

false beliefs, while its first meaning in Theosophy is illusion.

"These terms," observes Dr. Buckley, "are as valuable in affecting the ordinary mind as chloride of sodium for salt, capsicum for pepper, and H_2O for water. They serve also to make it appear that the Science is difficult, and that large fees for instruction are reasonable."

But when we turn from the symbolism of the new Christianity to its doctrines, and compare these with the teachings of Madame Blavatsky and her followers, the resemblances are so many and so minute that we are compelled to ascribe both to a common origin. The evidence is overwhelming that if Mrs. Eddy did not seize upon Madame Blavatsky's religious ideas when they first appeared, she has at any rate learned something of the Oriental philosophy from which the Madame professed to have derived her "Wisdom Religion."

Beginning with her definition of God, as we have already seen, Mrs. Eddy, in every important particular, teaches precisely what has been taught for ages by the Hindu philosophy. That system is pantheistic. Denying Pantheism, Mrs. Eddy holds steadfastly to its fundamental postulate, which is, God is all. Compare the following passages, in which the italicized words and phrases are the same in both authors:

From Mrs. Eddy—

> God is *identical with nature.—Science and Health,* p. 13.
>
> Christian Science strongly designates the thought that God is not corporeal (p. 10). Human conceptions would . . . say that an *anthropomorphic god* instead of infinite *Principle* is the Father, etc.—p. 153.
>
> God is individual, incorporeal, the Universal Cause, . . .

. . . all-inclusive. (Pp. 226-'7.) *Divine Principle, Reality,* and can produce nothing unlike himself . . the *eternal.*—p. 231.

From Madame Blavatsky—

We reject the idea of a personal or an extracosmic and *anthropomorphic God,* who is but the gigantic shadow of man, etc.—*Key to Theosophy,* p. 55.[1]

We believe in a universal *Divine Principle,* the root of all, from which all proceeds, etc.—*Ibid.,* p. 56.

When we speak of the Deity, and make it *identical with Nature,* the eternal Nature is meant, and not your aggregate of flitting shadows and finite unrealities is meant.—p. 58.

We occultists and Theosophists see in it the only universal and *eternal Reality,* casting a periodical reflection of Itself on the infinite spacial depths.—p. 76.

This last statement of Madame Blavatsky is her account of creation. God simply reflects himself through space; and she has also told us that this Nature thus created is not that composed of "flitting shadows and finite unrealities." We have seen how Mrs. Eddy rejects the Mosaic account of creation. Here is her own:

The creative Principle—Life, Truth and Love—is God. The universe reflects him. There is but one Creator and one creation. This creation consists in the unfolding of spiritual ideas and their identities, which are embraced in the infinite Mind, and forever reflected. These ideas range from the infinitesimal to immensity, and the highest ideas are the sons and daughters of God.—*Science and Health,* p. 496.

Here we have precisely the same thought as to the

[1] Quotations from *Key to Theosophy* are from second and revised American edition.

character of creation. It is a reflection or unfolding of God. There appears to be a difference only as to the duration of the universe. Mrs. Eddy apparently holds that it is eternal, while Madame Blavatsky holds that it is periodically "reflected" and then absorbed back again into God.

What do these two prophetesses have to say of Man?

Mrs. Eddy's account has already been given, and is simply that Man is the infinite idea or reflection of God, reflecting God as the image in the mirror reflects the man looking at the mirror. Man had no beginning, being "co-existent and co-eternal with God," and can "never be outside of his one-ness." Madame Blavatsky also holds to the same theory of the "unity of All in All." We have quoted Christian Science doctrine as to the fact that Man's only Mind is God, who is "Substance, the *invisible and indivisible,*" and that the "Principle" of Jesus is the "Father in secret" of whom he speaks, and is the "generic Mind of Man." Madame Blavatsky agrees with this precisely. "We say that the Spirit—the 'Father in secret' of Jesus—or Atman, is no individual property of any man, but the divine essence . . . *invisible and indivisible.*"[1] Here the agreement between these two antagonists is perfect.

We saw in her doctrine as to the first man that Mrs. Eddy believed in the preëxistence of men. Elsewhere she asserts this idea plainly, and argues to prove it true:

> If man did not exist before the material organization began he could not exist after the body is disintegrated. If we

[1] *Key to Theosophy,* p. 90.

live after death, and are immortal, we must have lived before birth; for if Life ever had any beginning it must have also an ending.—*Science and Health,* p. 427.

This is good Buddhism, as witness the following from Madame Blavatsky: "Both the human spirit or the individuality, the reincarnating spiritual Ego, and Buddhi, the spiritual soul, are preëxistent."—*Key to Theosophy,* p. 94.

The only difference between the two inspired teachers seems to be that the American denies that there is any sense in which God is in Man; but even in this the difference is but superficial. Says the Russian divinity, " . . . we believe with the Neoplatonists and the Eastern teachings that the spirit (*Atmâ*) never descends hypostatically into the living man, but only showers more or less its radiance on the inner man."—*Ibid.,* p. 91.

So, after all, this is, "scientifically" speaking, heavenly, which is to say, "harmonious with Truth," or otherwise with Mrs. Eddy's doctrine.

Theosophy, like Christian Science, appeals to the Scriptures when a text can be squeezed into service. And this teaching as to the preëxistence of man is held to be sustained by the question addressed by the disciples to Jesus, touching the affliction of the man who had been born blind. "Master, who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?" We might grant that the question shows at least the ignorance of the disciples; but the Master's answer was certainly not an admission of the doctrine in question, "Neither . . . but that the works of God might be manifest in him." Inasmuch as the doctrine of reincarnation is based upon the idea that birth itself is a misfortune, and in some sort a punishment

for misdoing in a former life, and that every affliction which we suffer here is to be accounted for by reference to Karma, or the law of cause and effect, otherwise retribution, which is held by both Buddhists and Christian Scientists, we cannot conceive how our Lord could have given a more emphatic denial to the doctrine. The disciples, tinctured possibly with theosophic errors, assumed that the poor man's blindness was due to the sin either of himself or his parents, and the Master corrected that assumption with an emphatic NEITHER.[1]

---

[1] There are some minds, imaginative and sentimental, to whom the thought of previous existence is exceedingly attractive. Wordsworth seems to have expressed his conviction of its truth in his well-known words—

"Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting,
The Soul that rises with us, our life's Star,
Hath had elsewhere its setting,
And cometh from afar;
Not in entire forgetfulness,
Nor yet in utter nakedness,
But trailing clouds of glory do we come
From God, who is our home.

Even Tennyson, true as he was to most of the essentials of Christianity, might be accused of being somewhat tinctured with this old philosophy. Witness the following in his last poem, full as that is of genuine Christian hope:

Twilight and evening star,
And one clear call for me,
And may there be no moaning of the bar
When I put out to sea;
But such a tide as moving seems asleep,
Too full for sound or foam,
When *that which drew from out the boundless deep*
Turns toward home.

Again, we observe an identity of doctrine in the two systems touching the doctrines of grace. We have seen how Mrs. Eddy sneers at "pinning one's faith to another's vicarious effort," and we find Madame Blavatsky repudiating the atonement, which,

---

But it is evident that he did not agree with Theosophists. In the last stanza of that swan song of his spirit we have the words—

> And though from out this bourne of time and space
> My soul may wander far,
> I hope to see my Pilot face to face,
> When I have crossed the bar.

Here is a clear expression of hope in personal immortality, and of desire to see that "strong Son of God," of whom he had sung in strains so sweet in his immortal tribute to his dead friend. Nor can we forget his passionate protest in *In Memoriam* against the doctrine which is the logical correlative of the Pantheistic notion of man's preëxistence—that of final reabsorption into the Soul of the Universe:

> That each who seemed a separate whole,
> Should move his rounds, and fusing all
> The skirts of self, at last should fall
> Remerging in the general Soul,
>
> Is faith as vague as all unsweet;
> Eternal form shall still divide
> The Eternal Soul from all beside,
> And I shall know him when we meet.

Tennyson was in full sympathy with much of the advanced thought which became current through the ministry of such men as Frederick W. Robertson and his own intimate friend, Maurice; but there is no evidence in all that he has written that he was at heart a Buddhist. Doubts he may have had, but, like his friend, he had learned how to slay those "spectres of the mind."

whether the vicarious actor be "God or man, is most revolting" to her, and also "most degrading to human dignity." Again, she pronounces that a dangerous doctrine which teaches that "no matter how enormous our crimes against the laws of God and of man, we have but to believe in the self-sacrifice of Jesus for the salvation of mankind, and his blood will wash out every stain." As to pardon, says Mrs. Eddy, "mercy cancels the debt only when justice approves;" and Madame Blavatsky remarks that one's innate sense of justice is perverted if taught that his sins will be forgiven because another man has been put to death for his sake. Mrs. Eddy goes out of her way to scout and repudiate "the old doctrine of foreordination;" Madame Blavatsky and her followers take pains to quote and condemn the Westminster Confession of Faith, and the Madame herself roundly denounces election as a "cruel and idiotic doctrine which makes of God a senseless fiend."

The affinity between Mrs. Eddy's system and modern Theosophy appears still more plainly in her teachings as to the future life. It is a fundamental notion of this popular form of Buddhism that human beings are in a state of transition, and destined to be re-born again and again until at last absorbed into the divine essence. We have seen how Christian Scientism teaches that mortals are all destined to "disappear," and man to become at last identified with the Christ-Principle. We observe in all its literature a studious avoidance of anything that looks like the doctrine that human personality, as we are conscious of it here, is to survive and characterize the eternal state of man. Nor do we find anything definite in the system touching heaven and hell, and the experiences of the soul

in the future life. Heaven is harmony, and hell is discord, both here and hereafter—so much, and no more, are we told concerning our future life. The explanation of all this significant silence and nebulous dogma is that Mrs. Eddy believes in re-birth and in the transmigration of souls!

Those who reach this transition called death, without having rightly improved the lessons of this primary school of mortal existence,—and still believe in matter's reality, pleasure and pain,—are not ready to understand immortality. Hence they awaken only to another sphere of experience and must pass through another probationary state before it can be truly said of them, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord.—*Unity of Good,* p. 3.

Man is not annihilated, nor does he lose his identity by passing through the belief called death. After this momentary belief passes, at the moment of death, from the erring mortal mind man finds himself still in a conscious state of existence, and that he has but passed through an extreme moment of mortal fear to awaken with thoughts and being *as material as before.* . . . Spiritualization of thought is not attained by the death of the body but by conscious union with God. When we are on the same plane of conscious existence with those gone before, we shall be able to communicate with them and recognize them, and when we have done our work here well enough not to have to do it over again, that change increases all our joys and means of advancement.—*Christian Science Series,* No. 1, p. 9.

The Buddhism of these extracts is plain. Theosophical writers have much to say about "planes of being" and "planes of consciousness," and it is a favorite doctrine of theirs that in the future life we will be able to recognize and hold intercourse with none but those who are on the same "astral plane" as we ourselves. In the extract just quoted we have ob-

served the same doctrine. But some Buddhists believe that men may be re-born as apes or peacocks. Mrs. Eddy seems to be in doubt upon this point. She only ventures to hint that unless we accept her gospel there is danger of our being doomed to a second experience of material existence. And where, pray, shall we do our work, if doomed to do it over again, unless the effort be repeated in this world? Has she not taught us by implication that Jesus failed as the first man, and so had to be re-incarnated? And, again, if we may be doomed to a second experience of mortal existence, why not, if unfaithful, to a third and a fourth? Why not, also, be in danger of sinking to the plane of bestial life? For these questions our oracle has no answers. Having taught the general principle, she leaves her pupils to work out such applications as may be suggested by the hardihood of their faith.

Mrs. Eddy is silent touching the rapture, the song, and the exalted praise and holy service of the heavenly state. Madame Blavatsky speaks out plainly, "What between truncated angels, brass trumpets, golden harps, and material hell fires, the Christian heaven seems like a fairy scene at a Christmas pantomime." (*Key to Theosophy,* p. 152.) Mrs. Eddy is less candid and more politic. She does not denounce orthodox teaching and contradict the Scriptures on these points as she does on so many others, but she does not discuss particularly the question of the future life of the blessed. Why this silence touching the most precious hopes which the gospel brings to our fallen race? Evidently because in her system immortality is the immortality of God himself, and nothing else. The hope of Christian Scientism is the hope of Bud-

dhism, of Brahmanism, and of Pantheism. It is to be merged at last in the divine essence, and to have at last no being or consciousness distinct from God's.

Such a hope seems to be flattering to our self-importance, until it is examined in the light of reason, and then it is seen to be not one whit better than blank Atheism. It is but another form of the doctrine that death is an eternal sleep, since this absorption into the Divine Principle is placed at the end of the round of births and deaths. The final death, or at all events the triumph achieved in the last stage of material existence, ushers the spirit into "the consciousness of oneness with Being," in which the sense of personality disappears. God himself, in any wise, knows us altogether, and divine memory, unless we conceive of God as himself unconscious and unthinking, will register our fleeting life. If, then, our human personality is destined to be merged into the impersonal divine essence, that "deification of mortals" is to our souls, with all their hopes and longings and thirstings for immortality, but a shining entrance into eternal oblivion. The doctrine is a glittering mockery of human hope and human affection. As one has well said, "Pantheism is Atheism." He who surrenders his faith in a personal God and in a personal immortality, may fancy himself emancipated from the thraldom of superstition, but he has in fact been robbed of the most joyous hopes that ever cheered our poor, frail humanity. He has become an Atheist indeed, "without God and without hope in the world."

If we would know what effect upon human ambition and character this faith exerts, we have but to look across the seas, and witness the despairing apathy which has settled down upon all the nations which

have been subjugated by the religion of Buddha. Witness the stolid indifference of the Chinese, and the sad hopelessness of the Hindus, toward all that makes for progress and happiness. Woman is an outcast from social life, and maternity is a crime, whereever Buddha, the "Night of Asia," has shed abroad his blighting faith. Love for one's own mother is mixed with contempt for womankind wherever men have been taught that life is a punishment and a curse, and that salvation can only be attained by becoming freed from the fetters of matter and the illusions of mortality.

Theosophists, indeed, pretending, like Christian Scientists, to find in their doctrine of the oneness of the human soul, a basis for a true brotherhood of humanity, claim to exhibit great unselfishness, and vaunt their shadowy creed as the grandest inspiration of altruism and philanthropy. But a greater than Buddha has given an infallible mark by which a creed as well as a personal profession can be tested—"by their fruits shall ye know them." Tested by this criterion, Buddhism has been tried through the ages, and has been found wanting. Its votaries have been deprived of all motive to unselfish living in that they have been taught that the attainment of personal salvation is the supreme end of human endeavor, and that this salvation is not righteousness, but the extinction of all desire and sensibility. Mortification of the flesh, and not the service of humanity, is the end of the Buddhist discipline.

But without delaying further on this point, we observe, once more, that if Mrs. Eddy's inspiration is all original, it is a little singular that she and Madame Blavatsky both deduce their favorite doctrine of the

brotherhood of Man from the same pantheistic premise, and both enter the same claim for public recognition on the ground of their doctrine. Thus Mrs. Eddy: "Having one God, one Mind, establishes the brotherhood of man. . . . All have one Mind, one Soul."—*Science and Health,* p. 172.

And so also speaks Madame Blavatsky: "The identity of the soul and spirit of real, immortal man . . . would lead us far on the road of real charity and brotherly good-will."—*Key to Theosophy,* p. 40.

Lastly, in this comparison, we note that Christian Scientism resembles Buddhism in that it discounts the evidence of the material senses, and makes it the chief effort of human life to escape from their imperious rule. Both agree that the misery of the world is due to discord between the soul and its fleshly environment. Mrs. Eddy bids her followers discredit the testimony of the senses, and thus attain the "consciousness of oneness with God." Buddhism teaches that through the destruction of the senses we may attain *nirvana,* or complete peace, which is entire and final unconsciousness, though it be also union with the Absolute. In the Hindu fakir, lying on his back in the scorching sunshine of a tropical summer, his face plastered with mud, in which he has sown seed which must germinate before his painful vigil ends, or standing on a post for days and years together in constant effort to silence the voice of his rebellious senses, we see a spiritual kinsman of Mrs. Eddy and her followers. The latter teach that the way to harmony, which is their term for *nirvana,* is the destruction of our senses by the denial of their testimony to the reality of the external world and the facts of our conscious experience. Both are aiming at the destruc-

tion of sin and misery through the extinction of all passion and sensibility, and both look forward to a state in which all material "illusions" will have passed away forever.

Compare the following passages. The first three are from Buddhistic authorities. One is quoted by Dr. DuBose, in his masterly work on the three religions of China, and describes the famous meditation of Buddha under the Bodhi tree:

> He forced his mind as the night wore on to a strict sequence of thought, and as morning dawned the light he so long sought broke upon him, and he reached the goal of absolute intelligence; freed from the bondage of sense, perception and self, he has *broken with the material* world, and lives in eternity.

The second is from that favorite classic of Theosophists, the *Bhagavad Gîta,* and describes the "indestructible path" entered by those who are "free from attachments," and are "laboring for salvation":

> He who closeth all the doors of his senses, imprisoneth his mind in his heart, fixeth his vital powers in his head, standing firm in meditation, repeating the monosyllable OM, and thus continues when he is quitting the body, goeth to the supreme goal.—*Bhagavad Gîta,* sixth American edition, p. 60.

The third is also from the *Bhagavad Gîta,* in which Krishna advises that for the soul's purification one should—

> Practice meditation with his mind fixed on one point, the modifications of the thinking principle controlled, and the action of the senses and organs restrained. Keeping his body, head and neck firm and erect, with mind determined, and gaze directed to the tip of his nose, without looking in

any direction, with heart at peace and free from fear, the Yogee should remain, . . . his thoughts controlled, and heart fixed on me. The devotee of controlled mind, who thus always bringeth his heart to rest in the Supreme, reacheth that tranquility, the supreme assimilation with me.—*Ibid.*, p. 46.

These three passages, observe, are from recognized heathen writers. The next passage I quote is from Mrs. Eddy:

Detach sense from the body, or matter, which is only a form of human belief, and you may learn the meaning of God, or Good, and the nature of the immutable and immortal. *Breaking away from the mutations of time and sense,* . . . fixing your gaze upon the realities supernal, you may rise to the spiritual consciousness of Being, even as the bird which has burst the egg, and preens its wings for a skyward flight.—*Science and Health,* p. 157.

Here is striking resemblance, both of sentiment and expression. By the "spiritual consciousness of Being," it is plain that Mrs. Eddy means just what the Buddhist oracle does by "absolute intelligence," "tranquility" and "assimilation" with Krishna, which latter is one of the names given to the Christos Principle of Theosophy. "Breaking away from the mutations of time and sense" is certainly equivalent to becoming "freed from the bondage of sense, perception and self;" and in order to achieve this freedom we must act upon the Buddhistic plan, close the door and silence the voice of the senses, and thus "break with the material world."

Mrs. Eddy does not, indeed, give such minute directions as to the *modus operandi* as the Buddhist oracle does, as to standing, fixing the mind on one point, gaz-

ing upon the tip of the nose, pronouncing the monosyllable OM when quitting the body, etc. Her directions, however, though less definite, are practically the same as Krishna's. She would have her followers "detach sense from the body," and in order to do this, she would have them "enter into their closets" by closing the doors of sense, and in silent meditation, like that of Buddha under the Bodhi tree, gaze upon the realities supernal, until they can at last "peck their shells open with Christian Science" and—surpassing all other fledgelings—immediately "preen their wings" for a skyward flight. (*Science and Health*, p. 554.) The main difference between the two oracles is, that Mrs. Eddy does not tell precisely how the gaze may be directed toward realities supernal, while the Buddhist is expected to see them at or beyond the tip of his nose; but as the word *supernal* implies elevation, it is obvious that if his nose is properly elevated the Buddhist, even according to Mrs. Eddy, may be looking in the right direction. And as to the sacred monosyllable OM, who could object to that? It is assuredly as good as any other ejaculation for a dying Buddhist, Christian Scientist, Theosophist, or any other person who rejects the Bible, does not believe in audible prayer, and reckons himself his own saviour, a part of God, and the only divinity with whom he has to do.

No ingenuity of forced exposition, and no argument, however plausible, can convince any rational soul that all this heathenism is in accord with the teachings of Christ. The labored efforts made by Mrs. Eddy and her tribe to reconcile their borrowed philosophy with the plain and unequivocal statements of Holy Writ—which reconciliation need not trouble

them at all, since, as we have seen, they do not regard the Scriptures as "in any special sense inspired"—are only useful in blunting the sense of shock which the neophyte must inevitably experience in becoming acquainted with the high doctrines of the new revelation. Christian Scientists claim to be Christian, and profess reverence for that revelation without which there would be no Christianity in the world; but after the first few lessons are learned, and the beginner is able to subscribe the doctrine that God is all, and that matter and sin are unrealities, the road to "harmony" is plain, and all pretense of loyalty to Christ may be dropped.

In leaving this part of our subject, it may be proper to observe that neither Mrs. Eddy nor Madame Blavatsky can claim any originality for their system. An examination of their peculiar teachings, point by point, will convince any student of church history that these modern oracles have simply revived the teachings of the ancient Gnostics in every important particular. Glimpses of the Gnostic heresy appear in the New Testament. In the book of the Acts one sect of these ancient schismatics appears in the person of their founder, Simon Magus, to whom Irenæus gave the title of Master and Progenitor of all heretics in general, and of Gnostics in particular. Another appears in the second chapter of the Apocalypse, verses six and fifteen, from which it appears that the Nicolaitanes were distinguished by false doctrine and by scandalous lives. Paul warns us against "oppositions of science, falsely so-called," and marks "endless genealogies," or, as Alford happily translates it, "doctrines of emanations," as dangers threatening the purity of Christian doctrine. His word for science is

gnosis, and as all Gnostics believed in a god of some sort, and many called themselves Christians, they were the Theosophists or Christian Scientists of their time. Like the modern Theosophists, they claimed that theirs was the "wisdom religion" underlying all the religions and philosophies of the world. Like the Christian Scientists, they claimed that their doctrines and methods were peculiarly "scientific." Like both, they wrested the Scriptures to their own destruction, and looked down with contempt and pity on all who presumed to disagree with them. There were plain people, deeply versed in the wisdom which the Holy Ghost teacheth, even in that long-past day, who felt some degree of resentment that these heathenizing teachers pretended to have the only wisdom or science worth naming.

Gnosticism was Pantheistic, teaching that the real creation consisted of a series of emanations, or æons proceeding from God. It held to a sort of dualism, counting matter unreal and evil, and opposed to the real universe of spirit. Its doctrine of sin was that sin was of the flesh, attaching only to the perishing body, and this doctrine led some to practice mortification of the flesh as a means to holiness, as the Marcionites, while others, as the Nicolaitanes, threw themselves into the mire of licentiousness. Gnosticism held that, as God was not the author of evil, he could not be the creator of the visible, material world. Hence the invention of the demiurgic scheme of creation, in which one of the æons, or world-spirits, is represented as becoming possessed of a sinful passion for the embrace of the abyss, and thus falling into matter, and through this fall becomes the father of the demiurge, who proceeds to create the world. The Gnostic

doctrine of salvation was the final emancipation of the soul from the fetters of matter, and its saviour was a being whose humanity was only a phantom, and whose life was but a series of deceptive appearances. Gnosticism taught that the destiny of the race was to be at last elevated into union with the Christos in the *plerôma*, or "light which is unapproachable and full of glory."

The reader will see, if he will turn back to the teachings of our two oracles, that in all these particulars they have adopted the doctrinal system of the ancient Gnostics. Mrs. Eddy teaches them, if anything, more definitely than does Madame Blavatsky; but the latter does not hesitate to claim kinship with Gnostics in general and with Simon Magus in particular, identifying her system with theirs. Both hold to a doctrine of the Allness of God, and declare in the same words that God is "identical with nature." Both teach that the real creation was a reflection or emanation from God. Both hold to the reality and perfection of the spiritual universe, and to the unreality and sinfulness of the material world. Both agree that all sin is of the flesh; and we have seen how Mrs. Eddy's teachings tend to utter demoralization, while the character of Madame Blavatsky was the worst possible commentary on her doctrines. Madame Blavatsky did not unfold any very coherent system of creation, but as she claimed that her *gnosis* was the same as that historically associated with the names of Marcion, Basilides and Valentinus, we may rest assured that she held devoutly to the demiurgic scheme. In Mrs. Eddy's system, Adam takes the place of the Gnostic demiurge, or world creator. Christian Science agrees with Theosophy as that agrees with Buddhism, and

all with the Gnostics, in teaching the doctrine of pre-existence and re-incarnation, making salvation consist in "breaking away from the mutations of time and sense." Both agree that the fallen race is to be elevated into a union or spirit marriage with the Christos, and the harmony in which human personality disappears is the heaven to which they look. All this is heathenism, which has come down through the centuries. The old wine of false doctrine has been transmitted rank, whole and entire, unchanged in labels, skins or contents.[1] It is to-day, as it was in the time of Paul, an opposition of "science, falsely so-called," a wisdom that is *not* from above.

---

[1] A summary of the evidence in the premises may be found in my paper, "An Old Enemy with Two New Faces," in the *Presbyterian Quarterly*, April, 1899.

XVII.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE WORSHIP AND SACRAMENTS.

CHRISTIANITY is, more than any other, a religion of prayer. It teaches the privilege and manifold benefits of supplication, praise and thanksgiving; and it bids believers speak to themselves and to each other in "psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in their hearts to God." And, in addition to the verbal expression of our faith, joy, adoration, penitence and holy desires in our prayers and praises, we are bidden to remember our Lord in the supper which he ordained, and to administer to all who are admitted into the church the sacrament of baptism, which is at once the sign and seal of the blessings of the covenant of grace.

Touching all these particulars of Christian worship, the directions of the Scriptures are clear and minute. We are bidden to worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness. All men everywhere are bidden to pray, "lifting up holy hands unto God, without wrath or doubting." We possess the original hymn-book of the church in the Psalms of David, and many hymns have come to us from the earliest ages of the Christian era. We are told what is the nature, and have in the Word many examples of the form, of prayer. And as to the sacraments, the elements, if not the mode of administration, are plainly prescribed in each case. Water

is to be used in baptism, and the form of words is prescribed; bread and wine are to be used in celebrating the Lord's Supper, and the memorial, covenant and prospective character of the feast is plainly set forth.

The worship of any religious organization must of necessity be a concrete embodiment of its doctrinal system. Prayer has its theology. No man can sincerely preach the gospel and at the same time offer prayers that contradict the doctrines which he has proclaimed. Every hymnal used in the various churches of Christendom is a system of theology, more or less elaborate. Sacramental forms are impressive ritual presentations of Christian doctrine, as taught by the several churches of Christendom. Thus Rome, in her "sacrifice of the mass" and "holy eucharist," associates the doctrine of Christ's perpetual re-incarnation and perpetual sacrifice with the Lord's Supper, and makes every wafer and every particle of it a whole Christ, body, blood, soul and divinity. Her baptismal formulas teach baptismal regeneration. Her prayers teach the doctrine of purgatory, the invocation of the saints, the intercession of the living for the dead, the worship of Mary, and much else. Her hymns express the same doctrines that are set forth in her ritual and embodied in her seven sacraments.

It is natural, therefore, that Christian Science worship and sacraments should differ materially from the simple cultus of Christianity as it came to us from the apostles. But we can hardly repress a feeling of amazement at the discovery that Mrs. Eddy has not only introduced a system of doctrine alien to the teachings of prophets and apostles, but has even sought to revolutionize the worship of the church,

and to set aside altogether its sacramental observances. Her method is not opposition, but substitution. She retains prayer, hymn-singing, and sacramental rites, but each becomes, in her system, something entirely different and distinct from Christian worship as commonly understood and practiced.

Christian Science has its churches and its stated services. It counts among its pastors some men of respectable ability. There is much plausibility in the new gospel as proclaimed by its "lecturers;" but when we look into its worship we find hardly so much as a husk of true Christian devotion.

Aside from the preaching, we presume the services held in the "Mother Church," which is dedicated to the "dearest mother" of the new sect, may be considered typical of the services held elsewhere by this unique organization. Mrs. Eddy, unwilling, it would seem, to have her doctrine diluted at the fountain head, has designated her book *Science and Health,* and the Bible as the impersonal preachers in that particular church, the lesson sermon, as it is called, being an antiphonal reading from both books. These lesson sermons are the same as those published in the *Christian Science Quarterly,* and are used in all the churches. This antiphonal reading serves several valuable purposes. One is, to emphasize the equal authority of the two books. Another is, to bolster up the teachings of Mrs. Eddy by what may seem to be Scripture proof. A third is to associate in memory the teachings of Mrs. Eddy with the words of Scripture. All which, it will be observed, are valuable means of popularizing and impressing the great doctrines which she has been commissioned to teach.

Vocal prayer is not permitted, for reasons which

will appear presently. The hymns used are those composed by Mrs. Eddy and other members of the sect. They are chiefly compositions, apostrophic and hortatory in character, in which Life, Truth and Love are lauded, and the changes are rung upon the Allness of God, the nothingness of matter, and the supremacy of mind, etc. Of Christian Science hymnology, the following, by Ione G. Daniels, is, perhaps, a fair specimen:

Look forth, Oh, conscious child of God,
Into the spirit-realm of Mind;
The path that Jesus Christ hath trod
Is thy celestial joy to find.
Across the day no night hath spanned
The sea, sun-kissed from land to land.
Look forth! and in the Master see
The perfect life thine own should be.

Shut the material doors of Sense,
And let the Soul look forth alone.
The mortal mind is blind and dense,
And hath no being of its own;
With Mary at the Saviour's tomb
Its gaze is downward in the womb
Of sensuous elements, to find
The Lord of Life, Immortal Mind!

—*Seed.*

The nebulous character of the teaching embodied in such hymns adds not a little to the mystifying effect of the antiphonal readings; while the sense of complete stultification inevitably produced by the effort to believe the shadowy nonsense of Mrs. Eddy's philosophical creed, seems to have in it all the elements of profound religious emotion for those who have entered upon the "life of Science."

As to sacraments, it is obvious that in a system which has for its supreme tenet the doctrine that the external world is unreal, there is no room for any sacraments in which material symbols are used. Water, if used in baptism, and bread and wine, if used in the eucharist, would tend of themselves to upset the system by keeping alive some faith in a material world. Besides, if Mrs. Eddy and her followers should continue to use the forms of orthodoxy, many would unconsciously imbibe orthodox notions simply from the use of such forms. Hence there must needs be a complete divorce of Christian Science sacraments from all orthodox observances.

Mrs. Eddy defines baptism as "purification from error," "submergence in Truth," and from this it is evident that the only baptism which obtains in the new church is simply conversion to Christian Scientism. Speaking of baptism, Mrs. Eddy quotes also 2 Corinthians v. 8, as intimating also that the real baptism of the soul is never accomplished until one is assimilated with the "Universal Life." The first baptism her followers receive is "John's baptism," in the act of receiving her doctrines. The final baptism, unlike other Christians, she defers to a future life. So here is a very considerable difference, emphasizing a new interpretation of the Master's words, "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved."

The divergence between Christian Scientism and evangelical Christianity is no less glaring in the teachings of Mrs. Eddy as to the Lord's Supper. The Master said, "Do this in remembrance of me." His command was specific and perpetual, and was so understood by his apostles. Paul rebukes the Corinthians for their riotous and unbrotherly manner of

celebrating this feast of the Lord, and while pointing out the way in which it is to be decently observed, he says, "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show forth the Lord's death until he come." It is a sacrament, pledging the believer to continued faith and diligence; it is a spiritual partaking of Christ; and it is retrospective as to our Lord's death, and prospective as to his second advent. But, as we have seen, Mrs. Eddy thinks the second advent took place when she received her "feeble revelation," and it is of course superfluous to keep a feast in prospect of a past event! Moreover, the bread which she distributes to her disciples as the bread which came down from heaven, is Truth, which is to say, her own inspired doctrines. Therefore, her eucharist is "spiritual communion with the one God," her "cup is the cross," her wine the "inspiration of Love—the draught our Master drank and commended to his followers." (*Science and Health*, p. 340.) "If Christ, Truth, has come to us," she argues, "no commemoration is requisite; for he is Immanuel, or God with us; and if a friend be with us, why need we memorials of that friend?" (p. 339.)

This is evidently a view of the matter which did not occur to Paul and the other apostles. They rejoiced in his perpetual presence in the ministry of his Spirit; but they also remembered his saying, "Me ye have not alway." Although abiding with his followers in the fellowship of the Spirit, he was "absent from them in body," and there was a blessed and glorious sense in which he would come again, and with this hope of his coming they were wont to nourish their souls when they met at his table.

But a very effective way to drive out old ideas is

to substitute new observances for the old. And so we have the following somewhat indefinite account of a sort of sacrament which Christian Scientists are wont to celebrate. It is celebrated, according to Mrs. Woodbury, "without wafer or wine." Says Mrs. Eddy:

> The spiritual meeting with our Lord, in the dawn of a new light, is the morning meal which Christian Scientists commemorate. They bow before Christ, Truth, to receive more of his reappearing, and silently commune with the Divine Principle thereof. They celebrate their Lord's victory over death, his probation in the flesh after death, its exemplification of human probation, and his spiritual and final ascension above matter, or the flesh, when he rose out of material sight.—*Science and Health,* p. 340.

Here is a new mystery, embodying a new conception of our Lord's death, resurrection, post-mortem life on earth, and final ascension. His earthly sojourn after the resurrection was *a probation,* and signified human probation. Probation when? Obviously, since his own was but an exemplification of ours, ours also is "probation in the flesh after death;" or, in other words, a re-birth, or awakening in another state of existence "as material as before." From which it appears that Mrs. Eddy has made a most effective substitution in her "morning meal." The morning hour emphasizes the fact that it is *not* the Lord's Supper; and as to doctrinal import, it sets aside both the atonement and the second advent, and makes devout Scientists bow the knee in order to "receive more of his reappearing," which is to say, more of "Science!"

But the essence of all true worship is prayer. Christian hymns are but rhythmic prayers, set to music. Christian sacraments become the occasion of

prayer, and without prayer are meaningless forms. We have seen Mrs. Eddy's sneer at the worship of evangelical Christians. What does she teach as to prayer?

Of prayer, as understood by Christians generally, there can be none in any system which makes God an abstraction, and regards man's mentality as an emanation from God, and destined to be re-absorbed into its source. Madame Blavatsky, speaking for theosophists, is perfectly candid. "Being well-occupied persons, we can hardly afford," she tells us, "to lose time in addressing verbal prayers to a pure abstraction. . . . We cannot pray to the Absolute, . . . therefore we try to replace fruitless and useless prayer by meritorious and good-producing actions."[1] With this view Mrs. Eddy is in perfect accord. The doctrine of pardon, which, as we have already seen, is discarded by her, is vitally connected with the duty of prayer. That God does, upon certain conditions, pardon sin in answer to prayer, has been in all ages a cardinal doctrine of the church. It is one of the chief particulars which differentiates the religion of Christ from Buddhism. The Buddhist, aside from the difficulty of addressing prayers to a pure abstraction, does not believe in pardon. He recognizes his subjection to the law of an inexorable karma, or retribution, which visits upon the soul in its present state of existence the consequences of all sins committed in a former, and will visit upon it in its future life the results of sins unexpiated by the sufferings of this. Did he believe in a personal God, he could not, if he would, change this law of karma, through which

[1] *Key to Theosophy*, pp. 59, 63.

eternal justice operates in every age, and upon every plane of existence. His only plan of salvation is to extinguish his passions and desires, and, by avoiding new sins, to exhaust the accumulated karma of his past lives, and so at last to enter *nirvana*. And Mrs. Eddy's doctrine is the same—

> The destruction of sin is the divine method of pardon. Divine life destroys death, truth destroys error, love destroys hate. Being destroyed, sin needs no other form of forgiveness. Does not God's pardon, destroying any one sin, prophesy and involve the destruction of all sin?—*Science and Health*, p. 234.

It is not "scientific" to believe that God discriminates between the objects of his mercy. If he saves one soul, he must save all. In the same strain, Mr. Mason declares, quoting "our Teacher," that—

> By the destruction of sin, every one must at some time be freed from it. . . . Man can never be lost, nor can he ever cease to exist. But if he is a wilful sinner he will suffer until the chastening or natural result of the broken law has become so severe that he will seek the repose and happiness of right doing.—*Reminiscences of Class Room*, p. 9.

Hence it follows that consistent Christian Science prayer is nothing but an egoistic meditation, resembling a Buddhistic formula, without petition or thanksgiving. "The Infinite cannot do less than bestow all good, since he is unchanging wisdom and love," declares Pope Mary; and this being so, she hesitates to approve any definite requests in prayer. True, our petitions may have some subjective effect. The broadest of Christians will admit so much. But we must not imagine that God is in any wise affected by our prayers. "We can perhaps do more for our-

selves by our petitions; but the All-Perfect does not grant them simply on the ground of lip-service"—the opposite, of course, being the orthodox doctrine in the premises.—*Science and Health,* p. 307.

Our Lord commended importunity in prayer. But Mrs. Eddy is wiser than he, as witness the following:

> Goodness alone reaches the demonstration of truth. The habit of pleading with the Divine Mind, as one pleads with a human being, perpetuates the belief in God as humanly circumscribed,—an error which impedes spiritual growth.—*Ibid.,* p. 308.

Here is the wisdom of the serpent. By inducing her followers to surrender the habit of asking God for needed grace, she will succeed in cutting up all rational faith by the roots. So long as they continue to repeat such humble ascriptions of praise and thanksgiving and such petitions for divine help as God's saints in all ages have been wont to use, they will be proof against her vague doctrines in regard to the conglomerate abstractions which she would fain substitute for the God and Saviour revealed in the Word of truth. She proceeds, therefore, to argue against prayer with as much cogency of logic as a Voltaire or a Tom Payne ever exhibited:

> God is Love. Can we ask him to be more? God is Intelligence. Can we inform the Infinite Mind, or tell him anything he does not comprehend? Do we hope to change perfection? Shall we plead for more at the open fount, which always pours forth more than we receive? Does spoken prayer bring us nearer the source of all existence and blessedness?—*Ibid.,* p. 308.

Of course not, we are to understand. This would be but asking God to be God, and would there-

fore be but a vain repetition. It is not a sensible thing to do, this thing of pleading for pardon and asking a liberal outpouring of benefactions. "It is only necessary to avail ourselves of God's rule, in order to receive a blessing."—*Science and Health*, p. 308.

True prayer, according to this new reformer, is "the habitual struggle to be good" (p. 309). To enter into our closet means to enter "the sanctuary of Spirit, whose door shuts out sinful sense, but opens to Truth, Life and Love." There can be no real prayer in the spiritual exercises of those who refuse to obey the new gospel. They deliberately refuse to enter into their closets!

Moreover, the world at large is making a grave mistake in uttering audible prayers. In order to pray aright, we must "close the lips and silence the material senses." This was a part of the matter which the poor carpenter of Nazareth did not know enough to explain. But Mrs. Eddy, having quenched her soul's thirst by studying Buddhism, has a "Master thought" which makes her wiser than the ancients. In the simplicity of his mind, Jesus approved audible prayers, himself prayed aloud, and gave to his disciples a form of prayer. But, says Mrs. Eddy, while "audible prayer is impressive," and "gives momentary solemnity and elevation to thought," it cannot produce "any lasting benefit," its motives embracing "too much error to greatly forward Christian sentiment." Here, also, is evident the satanic method in her madness. She sees that all who continue to pray as Jesus taught his disciples to pray, will be unlikely to heed her teachings. Hence she urges gravely that such prayer "gives occasion for reaction unfavorable

to spiritual growth"—*i. e.,* for advancement in her way of thinking—and "militates against sober resolve, and a wholesome perception of God's requirements." Such "wholesome perception" must also of necessity include the conviction that our chief duty is to take *Science and Health* as the chief rule of our faith and practice. And having argued against prayer in such fashion, she indulges in a little mild ridicule of orthodox prayer. She hints that it is usually a self-satisfied ventilation of fervent sentiments, and declares that it makes us hypocrites and leads us into temptation, etc.—*Science and Health,* pp. 306-322.

Much that she says about prayer is true and just, and were it not in an essay against all real prayer, would serve some good purpose. But prayer that is not petition is not prayer at all. It may be praise or thanksgiving, both of which are indispensable in Christian worship; but it is not prayer. Our Lord himself defines prayer as asking, and whenever sinful man ceases to ask, he will cease to receive the grace he needs. No amount of sentimental desire and devout meditation can avail to substitute this duty. It is a primary law of the spiritual kingdom, "Ask and ye shall receive." "Ye receive not, because ye ask not."

How Mrs. Eddy would have us pray we may understand from her new version of the Lord's Prayer, which is perhaps the most successful of all her efforts to translate the Scriptures into the "new tongue" of Christian Science:

Our Father who art in heaven,
Our Father and Mother God, all-harmonious,
Hallowed be Thy name.
Adorable One,

Thy kingdom come.
Ever just and omnipotent.
Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.
Thy supremacy appears as matter disappears.
Give us this day our daily bread;
Thou fillest our famished affections;
And forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors.
And love is reflected in love.
And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil;
And leavest us not in temptation, but freest us from sin, sickness and death;
For thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.
For thou art all Substance, Life, Truth and Love forever. So be it.
—*Science and Health,* Edition of 1886.

This italicized version is a scientific prayer, and we are to understand its several phrases as giving the spiritual signification of their corresponding petitions in the Lord's Prayer. At a glance we see that it eliminates every essential Christian doctrine from that matchless "form of sound words," and substitutes for it something different. There is no word of petition in it, nor is there anything like a recognition of God's personality. Its address introduces an idea as to the Divine Femininity, thus making God a dual monad, which is without any scriptural foundation. "Yea, she may forget, yet will not I," said Jehovah, and there is no need to add to the words of holy writ an ascription which is without basis either in the teaching or the example of prophets and apostles. The first petition, instead of being a prayer, is a mere opinion that God ought to be adored. The second petition, instead of expressing desire for the coming of the heavenly kingdom in this world, simply declares

God's justice and omnipotence; meaning, we suppose, that the original was in error in its implication that God's kingdom had not come! The third petition, instead of asking that God's will may be done, startles us with a dogmatic assertion that the divine supremacy can only appear when matter disappears. In the fourth we are not to pray for daily bread, but simply to acknowledge that God fills our "famished affections;" nor may we, in the fifth, pray for the pardon of sin, since "love is reflected in love." There being no evil and no temptation, we may also, in the sixth, leave out those unrealities, and, instead of praying for deliverance from them, compliment our Father on having delivered us, and on the further fact that he is now freeing us from sin, sickness and death. The final ascription of dominion, power and glory to God, is turned into an abstract definition of Him, and the only particular in which this translation into the new tongue of Christian Science resembles the prayer as given in the Scriptures is the mysterious fact that Mrs. Eddy deigns to give the familiar translation of the venerable word, *Amen*. Even her marvelous invention has its limits. She could not invent anything to take the place of *amen*, except a simple translation. She leaves us the first two words and the last, and all else is transmuted into something as foreign to its original meaning and purpose as it is possible to conceive. The prayer is no longer a prayer but a creed; a creed, moreover, which is at war with every historic and distinctive doctrine of Christianity. No wonder this white-robed prophetess, with face all radiant from intercourse with her white-fingered angels, finds it necessary to keep at a safe distance from conservatism, lest she soil her garments!

If her doctrine is the "vesture of Truth," then the words of Jesus are indeed black and smudgy with falsehood![1]

---

[1] It is singular that Mrs. Eddy, after having argued so strongly against audible prayer, and also against all definite pleas for pardon or for any other blessing, and exemplified her doctrines by such a thorough mutilation of the Lord's Prayer, has apparently revised her doctrine in the premises so that it may be said to have advanced backwards. In the later editions of her book she has made sundry changes in her "spiritualized" version of the Lord's Prayer. In the 100th edition of *Science and Health* we have the following variations from the form as given above:

Thy kingdom come,
Thy kingdom is come, God is ever present and omnipotent.
Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven,
The supremacy of Spirit appears as the claims of matter disappear.
Give us this day our daily bread;
Give us grace for to-day;
Thou fillest the famished affections;
And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil,
And leave us not in temptation, but free us from sin, disease and death;
For thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever,
For thou art all Power, Substance, Life, Truth, Love.

The second petition is changed into a declaration—"Thy kingdom is come," and "ever present" is substituted for "just" where it occurs in the older version. In the paraphrase of the third petition it is not matter that disappears, but the *claims* of matter, Mrs. Eddy having remembered, apparently, that matter, being an unreality, or a figment of human imagination, cannot be "scientifically" said to disap-

It is interesting to note the variations which are the resultants from Mrs. Eddy's doctrine of prayer, as it flows farther and farther away from the fountain head. Mrs. Eddy's followers do not all of them dispense with prayers for pardon, nor absolutely deny

---

pear. The fourth petition, which in the older "spiritualized" version had ceased to be a petition at all, is once more made a prayer; but, inasmuch as food is unnecessary, and "gustatory pleasure" an illusion, which all Christian Scientists can conquer, we are bidden to pray, "Give us grace for to-day." No change appears in the fifth petition, but in the sixth, which the earlier paraphrase had made declarative, the form of petition is restored, so that Christian Scientists were for a time made to acknowledge temptation, sin, disease and death as evils from which they must needs beg to be delivered. The conclusion of the prayer is emended by inserting the word power and by leaving out "and" and "forever."

Now, comparing this version of 1896 with that of 1898—the 100th edition with the 154th—we find in the latter some startling changes. The third petition, instead of remaining as we have just given it, becomes

Enable us to know, as in Heaven, so on earth, God is All in All.

Thus we find her restoring in this place the form of petition, which she had discarded in both her former versions. The fourth petition, made partly a prayer and partly a declaration in the version of 1896, becomes altogether a petition in that of 1898, and in addition to the request, "Give us grace for to-day," the "Scientist" is bidden to say, "Feed thou the famished affections," instead of saying, "Thou fillest the famished affections." In the last petition we find another decided doctrinal rebound. In 1896 Mrs. Eddy was teaching her children to pray for deliverance from temptation, sin, disease and death. Now, however, for the second time, if not oftener, their immaculate Mother has discovered that such prayer is unnecessary, making her latest inspired

the reality of all human guilt. The following is an impressive prayer, taken from a text-book published by the President of the "New York School of Primitive and Practical Christian Science." This devout believer in a more extensive use of prayer than Mrs. Eddy seems to favor, advertises that his school will be free from "eccentricity, pretension and fanaticism!"

PRAYER FOR A DYSPEPTIC.

Holy Reality! We BELIEVE in Thee, that Thou art EVERYWHERE present. We really believe it. Blessed Reality, we do not pretend to believe, think we believe, believe that we believe. We BELIEVE. Believing that Thou are everywhere

---

translation of this prayer into the "new tongue" identical with that of 1886, only adding the word evil and *spoiling the grammar*. In repeating the latest paraphrase—unless a new one has been made since January 1, 1899—Christian Scientists are now butchering both the Lord's Prayer and the Queen's English, saying,

And thou leaveth us not in temptation, but delivereth us from evil—sin, disease and death.

In the conclusion of the prayer as given in the form of 1898, the words, "God is omnipresent Good," are inserted instead of "Thou art all Power." The thought of the Divine Goodness seems more comforting to Mrs. Eddy than that of the Divine Power.

And it is to be noted that in both the later versions which I have quoted, Mrs. Eddy leaves out the venerable Amen, which in her first paraphrase she translated. "Bible scholars" have discovered, she tells us, that this word is an addition to the Lord's Prayer by some copyist! From all which we gather that her method of explaining the meaning of the Scriptures is to turn them into something as unlike the original as is possible to imagine, and call that something the "spiritual sense."

present, we believe that Thou art in this patient's stomach, in every fibre, in every cell, in every atom; that Thou art the sole, only Reality of that stomach. Heavenly, Holy Reality, we *will* try not to be such hypocrites as every day of our lives to affirm our faith in Thee, and then immediately begin to tell how sick we are, forgetting that Thou art everything, and that Thou art not sick, and therefore that nothing in this universe was ever sick, is now sick, or can be sick. Forgive us our sins, in that we have this day talked about our backaches, that we have told our neighbors that our food hurts us, that we mentioned to a visitor that there was a lump in our stomach, that we have wasted our valuable time that should have been spent in Thy service, in worrying for fear that our stomach would grow worse, in that we have disobeyed Thy blessed law in thinking that some kind of medicine would help us. We know, Father and Mother of us all, that there is no such thing as a really diseased stomach, that the disease is the Carnal Mind, given over to the World, the Flesh and the Devil; that the mortal mind is a twist, a distortion, a false attitude, the HARMATIA of Thought. Shining and glorious Verity, we recognize the great and splendid FACT that the moment we really believe the Truth, Disease ceases to trouble us; that the Truth is there is no Disease in either *Real* body or mind; that in the mind what seems to be a disease is a False belief, a Parasite, a hateful excrescence, and that what happens in the body is the shadow of the LIE in the Soul. Lord, help us to believe that All evil is utterly Unreal; that it is silly to be sick, absurd to be ailing, wicked to be wailing, atheism and denial of God to say, "I am sick." Help us to stoutly affirm with our hand in Your hand, with our eyes fixed on Thee, that we have no Dyspepsia, that we never had Dyspepsia, that we will never have Dyspepsia, that there is no such thing, that there never was any such thing, that there never will be any such thing. Amen.

Christian Science is a higher and more practical Christianity, it is claimed. This is certainly a prac-

tical prayer, and its humble confessions of sin are quite edifying. Christian Scientists, bred to such praying, must needs have tender consciences.

I have now shown the origin, the claims, the absurdities, the unverified miracles, the undeniable failures, and the heathenish doctrines of Christian Scientism. It were idle to pretend that Mrs. Eddy has deduced her system in its entirety from the Bible. She certainly did not go to the Bible for her theosophical terms and Buddhistic theology. When she says, therefore, that in all her studies the Bible was her only text-book, she is either using the word text-book in an accommodated sense, or uttering a colossal falsehood. She quotes a number of books by name, and derives suggestions from many which she does not name. She derived her idealism from Berkeley, her mental healing system from homœopathic charlatanism and the mental and magnetic practice of Dr. Quimby, and her principal terms and doctrines from Oriental philosophy. Her claim of exclusive originality is an impudent pretense, and her assertion of plenary inspiration is a foul imposture.

But, inasmuch as she professes to have derived her system from the Bible, save as that defective volume had to be supplemented by revelations made only to herself, it may be worth while to examine briefly her methods of interpretation.

XVIII.

MRS. EDDY AS AN EXPOSITOR.

It will be readily seen by any one who will be at the pains to study Mrs. Eddy's peculiar interpretations of Scripture, that in all her expositions her effort has been, not to explain, but to twist and distort the Bible, so as to make it agree with her "sacred discovery." Her ignorance, cunning and presumption, always in evidence, are nowhere so conspicuous as in those passages in her works in which she essays to play the role of expositor. Ignorant of Hebrew and Greek, guiltless of both classical and theological lore, claiming a degree of inspiration such as renders her independent of all commentaries, and yet driven, as we have seen, to appeal to "modern scholarship" when she thinks such appeal will strengthen her cause with the ignorant and the credulous, she has given to the world what she boldly terms a "Key to the Scriptures."

The first thing that strikes the reader in examining her "Key" is that it is so small. It is, as it were, a skeleton key, if a key at all. It is made, evidently, not to fit the lock, as are keys used by householders, but resembles those which burglars use for the purpose of picking locks. Even this want of proper adaptation, however, could be overlooked, did it really suffice to open to our understandings a single passage. But it is safe to say that a more useless key for any one who has not already taken leave of common sense

could hardly be imagined. It not only does not unlock the door, but it seems to injure the lock, so that the bolt cannot be drawn. Christian Scientists, seeking to use this infallible key, cannot enter themselves, neither can they lead anybody else into the great temple of Revelation.

The first part of this magical Key, which proffers an explanation of all the dark sayings in the holy book, consists of an explanation, or translation into the "new tongue" of Christian Science, of the first chapter of Genesis and the first seven verses of the second. Proceeding still further in her exposition, the author first omits sundry passages, and then wanders away from the book altogether. The last fourteen pages of her commentary (?) on Genesis are devoted to a rambling essay on her favorite theme. The second part of Mrs. Eddy's "Key" is even more remarkable, both for what it does and for what it does not contain. It purports to be an explanation of the Apocalypse. Plunging at once, without so much as a word of explanation as to the reason of a proceeding so peculiar, into the middle of the book, she attempts to explain one verse of the tenth chapter of Revelation, sixteen verses of the twelfth, two of the twenty-first, and one of the twenty-second chapter. To this fragmentary exposition she adds the twenty-third Psalm, which her inspiration has authorized her to alter by substituting the word Love wherever the name of the Lord occurs, making it read, "Divine Love is my shepherd," etc. The whole body of Scripture, aside from these few passages, is left unexplained, save as the defects of her "Key" are supplied by her Glossary. This glossary is unique. It seems to be intended to serve somewhat the purpose of a Bible dictionary for "scientific"

students of the Bible. It gives the "spiritual signification" of the names of sundry Old Testament worthies, together with the definitions, according to Mrs. Eddy, of various words and terms used in the Bible and in *Science and Health*. By using these definitions, together with Mrs. Eddy's interpretations of such passages in Genesis and the Apocalypse as are explained in the "Key," and such other interpretations of Scripture as are found scattered through Mrs. Eddy's various works, the Christian Science "student" can manage, with proper straining, to turn many parts of the Bible into allegory, which is found to teach the main ideas of Christian Science.[1]

Mrs. Eddy's reasons for choosing the first and last books in the Bible for special explanation are plainly indicated. The book of Genesis contains a story of creation which must somehow be gotten out of the way, if Mrs. Eddy's doctrines are to be accepted. "The spiritual import of the Word, in its earliest articulations," she accordingly informs us, "often seems so smothered by the immediate context as to require explication;" while in the New Testament "so-called mystery and miracle, which subserve the end of natural goodness, are explained by that love for which the weary ones sigh, when needing something more native to their immortal cravings than the history of perpetual evil." Moreover, "the living and real prelude to the elder Scriptures is so brief that it would almost seem, from the preponderance of unreality in

[1] As a specimen of this allegorizing method, note the following: A writer in the *Rostrum* says David killed Goliath and four other kings, which means that the spiritual David, or Christian Scientist, must slay his five senses!

the whole narrative, as if reality did not predominate over the unreal," etc.: all which means that Bible students, unless specially instructed in Mrs. Eddy's doctrines, are little likely to find any Christian Science in Genesis, with its story of the creation, the first sin, and the fall, all which she has been inspired to deny.

In treating of the Apocalypse she plunges at once *in medias res*, and sees in the angel who appears in the tenth chapter "clothed with a cloud and a rainbow upon his head" nothing more nor less than "Divine Science." "When understood, it [Divine Science] is Truth's prism and praise; when you look it fairly in the face, you can heal by its means, and it hath for you a 'light that is above the sun,' for 'God is the light thereof.'" In the twelfth chapter she sees even more than this. "The Revelator," she says, "saw also the spiritual ideal, as a woman clothed in light, a bride coming down from heaven, wedded to the Lamb of Love. To him the bride and the Lamb represented the correlation of divine Principle and the spiritual idea, God and his Christ, bringing harmony to earth." Again, "the woman in the Apocalypse represents as man"—woman being, we must not forget, the highest species of man—"the spiritual idea of God, and God and man as the Divine Principle and the Divine idea."

Here, then, we have two reasons for her efforts to explain the Apocalypse. She thinks she sees Christian Science in it, and also herself. Our suspicion, that Mrs. Eddy fancies herself to be the original of the prophet's picture, grows into certainty as we read on. "As Elias represents the Fatherhood of God through Jesus, so the Revelator completes this figure with woman, as the spiritual idea or type of

God's Motherhood." In the judgment of her followers, Mrs. Eddy herself is *the* woman who has "completed the figure" by revealing the motherhood of God, and is therefore called Mother by them all, as she has taught them to call her. She is, therefore, to be regarded as the "woman in travail, waiting to be delivered of her sweet promise, but remembering no more her sorrow for joy that the birth goes on; for grand is the idea and the travail portentous." Proceeding, she explains that the opposition which her Science has elicited is a fulfillment of prophecy; that the serpent [*i. e.,* in the shape of orthodoxy] lies waiting to "bite the heel of Truth," and to "devour the offspring of the spiritual idea [herself], which is prolific in health, holiness and immortality;" that the "rod of iron" with which the man-child born of the woman—which is to say, redeemed humanity, born of Mary Eddy—is to rule the nations, is Divine Science; and that this "immaculate idea, represented first by man [*i. e.,* Jesus Christ], and last by woman [Mrs. Eddy], will baptize with fire;" which fire also must be Divine Science, since it will "burn up the chaff of error with the fervent heat of Truth and Love, melting and purifying the gold of human character;" and that the war made upon her in her ministry "has impelled this idea [herself, that is] to rise to the zenith of demonstration, destroying sin, sickness and death, and be caught up unto God—be found in its [her] Divine Principle." She is fully confident of her ability to guide the redeemed race—Christian Scientists—into all truth and on to glory; for, like the pillar of fire and of cloud, this "spiritual idea" (herself) will "guide all right desires in their passage from sense to Soul,—from a material sense of existence to the

spiritual,—up to the glory prepared for them who love God." She is confident that she will not be without allies in her holy war. "In this age the earth will help the woman; the spiritual idea will be understood."

While it is true that she does not anywhere claim to be the woman spoken of by the prophet, she does claim to perform precisely the same functions which she assigns to the woman, and thus, by her own favorite hypnotic method of *suggestion*, hint to her children that which they now openly avow. That Mrs. Eddy is a new Theophany, performing a work of redemption complementary to that performed by our Lord, and necessary to its completion, and that she is the spiritual idea reflecting God's own light, and "wedded to the Lamb of Love," is, as we have shown, the belief of the new sect. This belief she has managed to originate and keep alive in such a way that the unwary can hardly tell how they attained to it. Thus, there is no mention of Mrs. Eddy in the following sentence: "This idea reveals the universe as secondary and tributary to Spirit, from which it borrows its reflected Substance, Life and Intelligence." But the simple soul reading these words with full faith in Mrs. Eddy will say, Has not Mrs. Eddy revealed to us that the universe is secondary and tributary to Spirit? and that Man's only Life, Substance and Intelligence is reflected from God? And must she not be, therefore, the woman, or spiritual idea of whom the prophet speaks? So they do conclude, with one accord. "The followers of Mrs. Eddy," says a former Christian Scientist, who knows whereof she speaks, "assert that these passages refer to Mrs. Mary Mason Baker Glover Patterson Eddy, who was born

in the neighborhood of Concord, New Hampshire, nearly four-score years ago." As Mary was the mother of Christ, so is Mrs. Eddy held to be the mother of the new Christ, or redeemed humanity, which is to rule the world with Christian Science. Hence it is that her disciples exalt her, as we have seen, to a station of equality to that assigned by Romanists to the Blessed Virgin, and look forward to the time when all nations shall call Mrs. Eddy blessed.

It is surely unnecessary to argue that Christian Science cannot be both the angel who makes his appearance "clothed with a cloud," and the little book which that angel holds in his hand; and if it is either of these it can hardly be also the rod of iron with which the child of the woman is to rule the nations. With quite as much propriety it might be claimed that John Bunyan, when he wrote his *Pilgrim's Progress*, was guided by the Spirit of inspiration to make it all an allegory of Christian Science; and that Evangelist is Christian Science, the wicket gate is Christian Science, and that both Interpreter himself and the beautiful palace which he shows to the pilgrim; the wall that was called salvation; the porter, Watchful, and the maidens, Discretion, Prudence, Piety, and Charity, together with the pilgrims, Faithful, Great Heart, Christian and the rest—one and all stand for Christian Science. And yet this fairly illustrates the way in which Mrs. Eddy manages to see Christian Science in the Bible. She turns every narrative into an allegory, and makes every prophecy a prediction, and every name a symbol, either of Christian Science or its opposite, in every case backing stupendous assertions with others still more stupendous.

The way in which Mrs. Eddy professes to arrive at

some of her definitions is amusing. It was by applying the *reversible principle* to certain Bible statements. But the reversible principle, which is of doubtful utility in the manufacture of clothing, is manifestly inapplicable to many other articles of human use. We want umbrellas, for instance, and shoes that are not reversible. And so of Bible statements. The Bible tells us that God is light; but we do violence to the truth when we reverse the statement, and say that light is God. So also, when the Scriptures tell us that God is love, and that he is good, we are not warranted in reversing these statements, and saying that all love is God, and that all goodness is God. Yet this is precisely what Mrs. Eddy has done. Her favorite name for the Divine Being is the double term, God, Good, which seems innocent enough until one gets at its real meaning. Then it is seen that she acknowledges no Divine Father, such as is the God and Father whom all other Christians are wont to worship and love, but in place of him would have us acknowledge Goodness, Love, Light, etc., as the "only living and true God."

So, too, when she uses the double term, "Christ, Truth." Christ said, "I am the way and the truth and the life," meaning, as the church in all ages has understood him to mean, that he is the medium through which we approach God, the manifestation and proof of the divine veracity and the embodiment of gospel truth, and the source of all spiritual life. But when we separate and reverse the several parts of the proposition, and say that truth is Christ and that life is Christ, we utterly confuse what else had been perfectly intelligible, and make doctrines which it is doubtful if any Christian Scientist is ready to

avow openly. It is a truth that water runs down hill, and we are compelled to say of every such proposition, "It is the truth." Now, would it be correct to say that the truth that water runs down hill is Christ? Manifestly, we cannot identify Christ with every possible statement of facts. He is not the mere sum of all truth—an indefinite series of correct statements. Thus, too, when we say Christ is the life. We cannot reverse this, and say that life is Christ. There are various sorts of life—animal, vegetable and spiritual. To say that Christ is the sum total of all the life in the universe, is to make him, not the personal Friend and Saviour whom the Scriptures represent him to be, but an impersonal force and intelligence, diffused throughout the universe. That Mrs. Eddy and her followers do this, simply shows how far they have erred from the gospel made known to us in that book which she has termed "the chart of life, to mark the healing currents and buoys of Truth."

Such a method violates every principle of language and of rhetoric. When we say that God is good, the word "good" is understood to be an adjective, describing the quality of the Being whom we term God. When we reverse the proposition, this adjective has become a noun, with an entirely different meaning. As an adjective, the word "good," applied to any intelligent being, describes moral character, implying the whole circle of praiseworthy qualities. But the same word used as a noun means benefit, blessing. Now, it is evident that, while God may be said to be our greatest good in the sense of being our highest blessing, it cannot be said that all blessing is God.

Mrs. Eddy, moreover, while intimating that she knows what "tropes and metaphors" are, ignores all

right interpretations of such figures of speech, when they would deprive her of a coveted proof-text. She converts tropical statements into literal at will, and then when it suits her convenience she takes the most evidently literal passages that are to be found in the Bible, and turns them into allegory, in order to twist out of them some seeming confirmation of her doctrines. Thus, it is plain that when our Lord said, "I am the way and the truth and the life," he was not using the words in a severe literal sense, but metaphorically, just as when he said, "I am the vine, and ye are the branches." But in her interpretation of the passage, Mrs. Eddy takes part of it literally, making Truth synonymous with Christ, but ignoring the fact that she must also, on the same principle, make life synonymous with him. The word Life, however, she has chosen to use as a synonym of God, and never uses it in speaking of Christ. Again, it is unquestionable that the Bible uses the word "mother" in the commonly accepted sense, and that no sacred writer ever applies that word to the Divine Being. But Mrs. Eddy's Glossary makes the word a synonym of the Divine Being. Does this account for the fact that one of her followers was brought before a court charged with being insane, because she asserted that Mrs. Eddy, who has taught her followers to call her "Mother," was none other than God?

Another device of Mrs. Eddy, in her effort to make the Bible square with her doctrines, is *direct contradiction.* Thus, God says, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." He affirms, through the word of his Son, that a man may gain the whole world, and lose his own soul. Now, Mrs. Eddy cuts the Gordian knot of difficulty in all such cases by simply contradicting the

Scriptures. She says that the soul cannot sin, nor can it be lost. If the Bible anywhere, or even Christ himself, says so, the Bible or Christ is mistaken. So, also, as to the judgment. "God," says Paul, "has appointed a day in which he will judge the world by that man whom he hath ordained." No, says Mrs. Eddy, "no final judgment awaits mortals." Numerous other instances could be given in which this oracle of Concord has coolly set aside the very plainest statements of that book which she tells us was her "only text-book" in her laborious task of bringing forth her immortal "discovery." In such cases it is evident that we must choose whom we will believe.

In *spiritualizing* the Scriptures, Mrs. Eddy gives many startling instances of her daring originality. Thus, she makes the question, "Adam, where art thou?" mean, "Consciousness, where art thou?" She tells us that Jacob at the brook Jabbok was alone, and wrestled with *error*, until at day-break the angel appeared, and gave him a new name, etc. Now, the inspired story says that Jacob was alone; but it does not say that he wrestled first with error or with anybody or anything. Its plain meaning is, that he was alone until the "man," or, as the margin has it, the "prince of God"—presumably the "Angel of the Covenant"—"came and wrestled with him until the breaking of the day." By thus inserting ideas that were never, even in faintest degree, implied in the original, she is enabled to make any historical passage teach Christian Science. Again, she tells us that Hebrews xii. 1, "Let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us," does not mean, as Christians have always understood it to

mean, that we are to lay aside all sin and selfishness, and devote ourselves patiently to doing the will of God; but that we are to "put aside material self and sense, and seek the Divine Principle and science of healing," or, in other words, be Christian Scientists. Mrs. Eddy's works teem with such revolutionary interpretations of scripture. She would have us believe that the stripes of Jesus, which heal our sin-wounded souls, mean the "denial of error," which is to say the denial of the assertion that Christian Science is not the truth. The first commandment means, when "spiritually interpreted," "Thou shalt have no belief of life in matter; thou shalt not know evil, for there is one life, even God, Good," etc. That is, Thou shalt be a Christian Scientist; for only in so doing canst thou acknowledge the true God, and escape the curse pronounced upon all idolaters. Paul's sublime argument for the safety of all believers is, that "if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." That is, as Jesus paid our debt to the violated law by his death, so, by virtue of his immortal life, will he make good to us his guarantee of salvation. He died to redeem us, and he still lives, to give us the benefits of the purchased redemption. Mrs. Eddy, however, in order to break the force of this passage, inserts the word *seeming* before the word *death,* makes life begin with a capital "L," and by these apparently slight alterations of the passage, makes it mean, "If we were reconciled to God by the seeming death of Jesus, we shall be saved by his God." To such devices she is driven by her determination to take out of the Bible every passage that teaches the reality and the vica-

rious character of our Lord's death, and even his personal immortality.

Another favorite device of this infallible expositor is that of *substitution*. Thus, "When reading the Scriptures, the substitution of the word *sense* for *soul*, gives the exact meaning in a majority of cases." This artifice enables her to break the force of all passages which teach that man is liable to lose his soul, and to suffer in the eternal world, and at the same time to deny the Christian doctrines of personal immortality and accountability. She is blind to the enormous absurdities in which this trick involves her, as is manifest from her use of the one hundred and fourth Psalm, the first verse of which she renders, "Bless the Lord, oh! my sense, and all that is within me, bless his holy name." Applying this principle of interpretation to one of our Lord's solemn warnings, the result is found to be startling. "What shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and lose his own sense?" Aside from all questions as to the correctness of this particular interpretation, it is evident to any one who has known much of Christian Science doctrine and mental healing that men and women may lose their sense, even in this world. Indeed, the only difference between these learned "Scientists" and their uncharitable critics, so far as the fate of the former is concerned, is this: The "Scientists" expect to lose their sense in some future life, and look forward to this loss as the heaven of which the Scriptures speak, whereas the cruel critics are so unkind as to hint that all who have accepted Mrs. Eddy as their spiritual Mother and guide may, according to their own creed, consider themselves already in heaven, inasmuch as they have already taken leave of their sense. And it is

characteristic of Mrs. Eddy's expository inspiration that it enables her to make the same thing serve most contradictory uses, as when she makes the loss of sense the "second death," as well as heaven. This is a discovery which ought to be patented.

But there are some passages in which she cannot substitute the word *sense* for *soul*. Mrs. Eddy is equal to this as to all other emergencies, as we might expect an inspired "spiritual idea of God" to be. "The proper sense of the word soul can always be gained by substituting the word *God* where the deific meaning is required." In all other cases we may substitute the word *sense*. Thus is she enabled to teach, on the one hand, that it is never the soul of any man, but only his sense of sin, that is lost, and on the other that God is the only Soul in the universe. Thus does she succeed in making the old Bible an entirely new book for her followers, and also in making the study of the Scriptures a task of surpassing interest and delight. "Scientists" profess to enjoy greatly their study of the Scriptures. There is so much in it that is new to their anointed eyes!

Still another of her expository inventions may be described as *inflation and rejection*. She first reads into a passage a meaning which no sane person ever dreamed of assigning to it, and then proceeds to dismiss it as unauthoritative, and to explain it as "error's" account. This is her method of interpreting the creation story. The latter part of the second chapter of Genesis, she tells us, "*must* be based on some hypothesis of error," because in it "Spirit is supposed to coöperate with matter in constructing man," and because the "preceding passage declares God's work to be finished." Either she does not know, or

else ignores, the fact that the first chapter of Genesis and the first three verses of the second give, as the Christian world believes, a general account of creation as a whole, and that the succeeding narrative gives a more particular account of the creation of man, of his probation, sin and fall, etc. Not even those "modern scholars," to whose authority she bows in conscious ignorance, have ever been able to find any material contradiction between the two accounts, and certainly none of them ever took the ground that in the second account, so-called, "Spirit is supposed to coöperate with matter in constructing man." She must know that this is not, and never was, the teaching of any orthodox body, or even of any respectable orthodox writer, if indeed, she ever heard of such a doctrine before she saw it for her own purpose in the creation story as given by Moses. She has simply read into the book a meaning which nobody but herself ever attached to it, and then proceeds to dismiss the whole account as mythical because of the ridiculous sense which she pretends to have discovered in it.

But Mrs. Eddy's inspiration and genius both attain their highest triumphs in her Glossary. The immense spiritual discernment which she has exhibited in her definitions goes so far beyond the acumen of all other lexicographers, and she finds such a wealth of Christian Science in the Scriptures, when once she is permitted to apply her magical explanations to its proper names, that a sense of her inspiration grows upon her enraptured followers as they traverse the new regions of scriptural investigation thus opened up to them by their leader. Already we have had some samples of the marvelous meanings which Mrs. Eddy

has elicited from some plain words. But when we turn to this Glossary, and examine its definitions one by one, our wonder grows, until we are led to exclaim, Oh! the depth of this woman's cunning! *Angels* are "God's thoughts passing to man." *Benjamin* means "a physical belief as to life, substance and mind," and also, among other things, "a gleam of the infinite idea of the infinite Principle, . . . that which comforts and supports;" which is to say, *Benjamin* means both the denial and the affirmation of Christian Science. *Bride* means "purity and innocence, conceiving man in the idea of God; the senses of Soul, which have spiritual bliss, and enjoy, but cannot suffer." *Bridegroom* means "Spiritual understanding; the pure consciousness that God, the Divine Principle, creates man as his own idea, and is the only creative power." *Canaan* is "a sensuous belief; the testimony of material sense." *Children* are "Life, Truth and Love's spiritual thoughts and representatives," and also "sensual and mortal beliefs," "counterfeits of creation, whose better originals are God's thoughts, not in embryo, but in maturity," etc. But, not to delay further on this point, it is indeed amazing how many and what diverse things appear to Mrs. Eddy as proper synonyms of her sacred science. Dan, one of the sons of Jacob, means "animal magnetism," while Gad means "Science, spiritual Being, understood;" and so, likewise, Elias, Euphrates and Hiddekel—two of the rivers of Eden—the new Jerusalem, and the Holy Ghost, all stand for Divine Science; and the river Gihon, to the astonishment and confusion of all who oppose woman's suffrage, is found to mean "the rights of woman."

These illustrations must suffice. A volume could

be written, and a most amusing one, on the various devices which Mrs. Eddy has adopted in order to make the Bible agree with her theories. But after all, her secret dissatisfaction with her ludicrous performance is manifest in various complaints which break the monotony of her boundless egotism. Often she complains of the inadequacy of the translation of the Scriptures, and as a last resort asserts that the chief difficulty in the teaching of Christian Science lies in the imperfection of the English language. "English," she informs us, "is inadequate to the expression of spiritual conceptions and propositions, through the use of material terms." The trouble is, not that the English language is such an imperfect vehicle of thought, but that Mrs. Eddy neither fully comprehends the thoughts which she would set forth, nor the language which she is compelled to use. She is a striking specimen of a type of teachers whom Paul describes in his First Epistle to Timothy:

"Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned: from which some having swerved, have turned aside unto vain jangling; desiring to be teachers of the law; understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm."

Or, to adopt her own paraphrase of the apostle's words, which she applies to "error": "The mark of ignorance is on" her "forehead, for" she "neither understands nor can be understood."

XIX.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.

"Christian Science" originated in conscious charlatanism and fallacious reasoning, if the testimony of its founder is to be believed. If we credit the testimony of her rivals, which is abundantly corroborated by her own published statements, the system which she claims to have discovered in 1866 had been, in all its main features, taught for years before his death by Dr. P. P. Quimby, at whose feet Mrs. Eddy sat during his later life, and in whose footsteps she professed to be following even after his death. Mrs. Eddy's claim, that she received her doctrines by direct revelation, is thus disproven, not only by the intrinsic absurdity of the doctrines themselves, but also by the abundant evidences that she had been taught the same theory some years before she professed to discover it. Under the mask of saintly charity, she strives to conceal a bitter and implacable enmity toward true scriptural Christianity. Professing to revere the Bible as "the chart of human life," she and her followers are sparing no efforts to set aside that venerable volume in the interests of a book which is destined to be regarded in time to come as a monumental exhibition of ignorance, incapacity and unreason, and as a sad commentary upon the gullibility of mankind. "Christian Science" has developed into a new and fanatical Mariolatry, in which the worship of Mary Eddy exceeds, in all but its ritual, the

exalted homage paid by the Roman Catholic and Greek Churches to the mother of Jesus. Its philosophy violates every principle of reason, and involves its votaries in innumerable absurdities and inconsistencies. Its alleged miracles are, so far as they can be verified, due either to mere coincidence, or to the operation of mental factors now universally recognized and taken into account in the practice of all intelligent physicians. Its curative methods are based chiefly upon the hypnotic principle of suggestion, and according to the testimony of its own adherents it labors under the suspicion of affording to its practitioners unbounded opportunities for hypnotic imposition. Its failures are so many and so signal as to furnish a sufficient refutation of its claim to be a divinely revealed system by means of which all diseases can be healed on "a demonstrable principle." Its doctrinal system is diametrically opposed to the teachings of the Scriptures touching God and man, the creation, the doctrines of grace, the moral status and final destiny of the human race, as to angels and demons, and as to the future life. Discarding the Christian sacraments instituted by our Lord and cherished in the church from the days of the apostles, it substitutes rites that are anti-Christian both in spirit and in feature. When compared with modern Theosophy and with ancient Gnosticism, this new creed is found to agree with both in its unscriptural tenets, and to have borrowed from the former a large part of its nomenclature. And, lastly, its interpretations of the Scriptures exhibit boundless ignorance, stupidity and presumption — interpretations so unwarranted, either by sound scholarship or sound reason, that it seems passing strange that any rational soul should

be attracted to such a chaff-heap in search of spiritual food, and stranger still that any sane mind can be satisfied with such bold travesties of scriptural exegesis.

Christian Science is both a foul imposture and a heresy ominous of danger to the church of Christ, and of peril to immortal souls. It is a so-called science which ignores God-given facts; a philosophy which stultifies God-given reason; a religion which thrusts aside a God-given revelation; a theology which abolishes God while pretending to deify mortal man; a Christianity which, after dishonoring Christ by every possible denial of his word, presents him to us as a phantom Saviour who disappeared more than eighteen centuries ago—a Saviour who never did, and never can, save a soul, and who, having gone from earth, will never again return to bless his waiting and longing church. In a word, it is a philosophy without wisdom, a science without facts, a religion without rational worship, a theology without a God, and a Christianity without a Christ.

This new rehash of ancient heresies, not only in its name, but in its spirit and substance, fully merits the description of error long ago given by Paul, and once more makes timely his warning to every man who bears a responsibility like that which rested upon the young pastor of the church at Ephesus:

"Keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and

OPPOSITIONS OF SCIENCE, FALSELY SO-CALLED,

which some professing, have erred concerning the faith."

INDEX.

[*It has been the author's aim to make this Index sufficiently complete to enable the reader to find readily* (*1*) *the page or pages in which any particular topic referred to in this book is discussed;* (*2*) *the page or pages on which the teaching of Christian Science authorities as to any phase of their so-called science is presented;* (*3*) *all citations from authors quoted; and* (*4*) *all cases of healing referred to. The figures refer to the pages of this book.*]

Absent treatment, Christian Science, failures of, 161, 166.
Adam, explosive definition of by Mrs. Eddy, 221.
name of, divided by Mrs. Eddy for expository purposes, 223.
origin of, according to Mrs. Eddy, 224.
not the first man, according to Mrs. Eddy, 194.
was the creator of the world, according to Mrs. Eddy, 220; also according to Brigham Young and the Mormons, 220.
Adderton, Mrs. R. Stokes, statement of, as to remarkable answer to prayer, 104.
Adventist Church, origin of, 13.
Africa, witch doctors of, cures by, 106.
Age, youthful appearance in, 99.
Ages, should not be recorded, says Mrs. Eddy, 98.
Alcoholism, facts of, vs. Christian Science, 177.
Alienation, domestic, produced by Christian Science, 214.
Americanitis, poem by Mrs. Woodbury, quoted, 166.
Angels, personal, existence of, denied by Christian Science, 241.
Anti-fat, Christian Science article of, unsatisfactory, 96.
Apostles, controversies of, 21, 22; miracles of, 151; no failures of, in healing, 152.

Articulata, mollusca, etc., created by mortal thought, according to Mrs. Eddy, 220.
Atonement, vicarious, denied by Christian Science, 80, 81, 195, 198.
Attention, expectant, effects of, 115, 116.
Authors and books, etc., quoted:
Arena, The, 38, 46, 52, 206, 239, 243.
Beauprè, Dr. 176.
Bhagavad Gita, 260, 261.
Blavatsky, Helena P., *Key to Theosophy*, 249, 251, 254-6, 274.
Boston Herald, 66.
Brown-Sequard, Dr., *Lectures on the Physiology of Central Nervous System*, 174.
Buckley, D. D., LL. D., Rev. J. M., *Faith Healing, Christian Science and Kindred Phenomena*, 95, 118-19-20, 127-8, 147, 173-4-5, 248.
Burns, Robert, *Poetical Works*, 134.
Carpenter, Dr. W. B., *Mental Physiology*, 113.
Cocke, Dr. J. R., *Hypnotism*, 123, 128.
Channing, D. D., Rev. W. E., *Works*, 192.
Charlotte (N. C.) *Observer*, 167.
Charleston (S. C.) *Sunday News*, 60.
Christian Science Journal, 53, 54, 61, 133.
Christian Science Sentinel, 68.
Christian Science Series, 31, 54-5, 96, 194, 235, 255.
DuBose, D. D., Rev. H. C., *The Dragon, Image and Demon*, 260.
Eddy, Mrs. Mary Baker,
in *Christian Science Sentinel*, 68.
in *Christian Science Series*, 194, 234-5, 255.
in *Rudiments and Rules of Christian Science*, 57, 229.
in *Unity of Good*, etc., 56, 140, 189, 200, 216, 255.
in *Science and Health*, 31-6, 48, 50-2-4-5-6-7-8, 73-6-7-8-9, 80-1-2-6-8-9, 90-1-2-3-4-7-8, 100-1, 140-1-2-3-4-5, 153-4-5-6-7-8-9, 160-1-3, 181-2-3-9, 194-7-8-9, 294-6-9-10-13-15-16-19, 220-1-3-6-8-9, 230-2-3-4-5-6-7-8, 240-1-2-8-9, 250-1-4-9, 261-2, 271-2-3-5-6-7-8-9, 281-2-7-8-9, 290-1-3-4-6-7-8-9, 300-1-2.

Authors and books, etc., quoted—
Encyclopædia Brittanica, 171, 202.
Holmes, Dr. Oliver Wendell, *Medical Essays*, 43.
Homiletic Review, 25.
Independent, 31.
Judge, William Q., *Ocean of Theosophy*, 246.
Kansas City *Star*, 16.
Lafferty, LL. D., Rev, J. J., in Richmond *Christian Advocate*, 171.
Law Notes, 17, 18.
Macaulay, *History of England*, 105.
Marston, Dr., 39.
Mason, Rev. Frank E., *Reminiscences of Class Room*, 192-3, 201-5-8, 275.
Murchison, Dr., 115.
New York *Mail and Express*, 72.
Paris, Dr., 124-5.
Payne, Dr. R. L., *Mental Factors in the Cause and Cure of Disease*, 115, 155-6.
Peoria (Ill.) *Journal*, 67.
Pepper, Dr., *System of Medicine*, 173-5.
Reed, D. D., Rev. R. C., in *Presbyterian Quarterly*, 14.
Rostrum, The, 75, 85, 193-4-5, 288.
Seed, The, 75-6, 89, 182, 195-6, 204-5, 230-1.
Tennyson, Alfred, *Poetical Works*, 252-8.
Tuke, Dr., *Influence of the Mind on the Body*, 102, 115.
Wilmans, Helen, 162.
Wilson, Dr. Andrew, in *Harper's Magazine*, 130.
Woodbury, Mrs. J. C., 65, 132.
Arena. See *Arena*.
Christian Science Voices, 55-7, 63-4, 214.
War in Heaven, 35, 63, 65, 239.
Wordsworth, William, *Poetical Works*, 252.
Auto-Hypnotism, 128.
Baptism, is what in Christian Science, 271.
Barnes, Geo. O., a faith healer, 104.
Bathing, opposed by Mrs. Eddy for "scientific" reasons, 92.
Beauprè, Dr., on Cretinism, 176.

Beecher, Rev. Henry Ward, vigor of, 99.
Berkeley, Bishop, idealism of, 85–6.
Bethshan, cures at, 103.
Boardman, Rev. W. E., faith cures by, 103.
Body, influence of mind on the, 169.
Boils, "scientific" prescription for, 56.
Bread pills, an efficient purgative, 147.
Breda, siege of, effect of delusion during, 121.
Bright's Disease, sometimes imaginary, 148.
Buckley, LL. D., Rev. J. M. See AUTHORS.
Buddhism, Mrs. Eddy in agreement with, 245–262.
Buzzell, Dr., cured cholera by thrashing patient, 122.
Cancer, cure of, reported by Mrs. Eddy, 140.
Cholera, case of, cured by thrashing, 122.
Christ, atonement of, denied by Christian Science, 80, 81, 195-8.
  birth of, spiritual and not physical, according to Christian Science, 202.
  death and resurrection of, denied by Christian Science, 199, 200–1.
  divinity of, denied by Christian Science, 192–3.
  doctrine of Mrs. Eddy concerning, 192–209.
  place of, in Scripture, 190–1.
  second advent of, occurred in 1866, according to Mrs. Eddy, 206.
  sufferings of, their reality denied by Christian Science, 299.
Christian Science, animus of, toward the church, 79-82.
  absurdities of, 84-101.
  basis of truth in, 114–125.
  Buddhism by another name, 251, 261–2.
  built on law of suggestion, 132.
  challenge of, 31.
  claims of, 18–19, 33–5–6.
  compared with faith healing, 102–113.
  compared with Hypnotism, 126–138.
  compared with Theosophy, 245–266.
  compromise with, impossible, 19–20.

Christian Science—
contradicts Scripture, 185–6–7, 190–1–2–4–5–6–7–8–9, 200–1–2–3–4–5–6–7–8–9, 215, 218, 220–1–2–5–6, 231–2–5–7–8, 240–1–2, 251–2–4–5.
cost of instruction in, 36–7.
dangers of, 18–19.
doctrinal contents of, 181–302.
failures of, 163, *et seq.*
general view of, 31, *et seq.*
Gnosticism revived, 263–5.
gospel, a new, 33, 53–4–5.
immoral tendencies of, 239.
in conflict with the law of the land, 15–18.
insanity results from faith in, 214–15.
institutes, etc., 32–4.
miracles of, examined, 139, *et seq.*
misnomer, a, 33.
not original with Mrs. Eddy, 44–5–6, 70–1.
origin of, 43.
practice of, rules for, 150–162.
presents Mrs. Eddy as an object of worship, 59–65.
pretensions of, to science, 34.
services of, 269.
sets aside the Scriptures, 77.
statistics of, 30–1.
terms of, obscure, why, 248.
Christian Scientists, a growing body, 31–2.
families of, notably childless, 239.
worship their religion, 210.
Clothing, unnecessary, according to Christian Science, 91.
Cocaine habit cured by Hypnotism, 128.
Cocke, Dr. J. R. See Authors.
Consumption, cures of, reported by Mrs. Eddy, 140–1.
cured by falling into water, 122.
simulated by liver complaint, 148.
spontaneous recoveries from, 117.
Controversies of apostles, 21–2.
of reformers, 23.

Controversy, church established by, 21–2–3.
unwise deprecation of, 21.
Cough, hysterical, cured by anger, 121.
nervous, cured by Hypnotism, 148.
Creation denied by Christian Science, 219.
Cretinism, facts of, conclusive against Christian Science, 176–7.
Criticism, cure by, 122–3.
Coincidence, illustrated, 123–4.
Cullis, Dr., faith cures by, 104.
Dana, Charles A., vigor of, 99.
Davy, Sir Humphrey, cure of paralysis by, with thermometer, 119.
Death expected to disappear in triumph of Christian Science, 87–8.
Demonophobia, the wretched superstition of Christian Scientists, 243.
Devil, is father of all who are not Christian Scientists, according to Mrs. Eddy, 42–3.
Devils, existence of personal, denied by Christian Science, 241–2.
Diagnosis, possibility of mistakes in, 139–148.
Dipsomania, cured by Hypnotism, 128.
Discussion of Christian Science, probable benefits of, 25–26.
Diseases which may be cured by Christian Science, 169.
Dropsy, case of, cured by Mrs. Eddy, with unmedicated pellets, 42–3.
Dyspepsia, simulates many other diseases, 148.
Ear, cut off, restored by Christ, 151.
Eating, inconsistent advice as to, 101.
unnecessary, according to Mrs. Eddy, 101.
Ecclesiasticus, opinion of, as to physicians, 111.
Eddy, Mrs. Mary Baker, complains of imperfection of English language, 302.
considered a Jesus, 70.
contradicts Scripture. See Christian Science.
contrasted with Jesus, 39–40.

Eddy, Mrs. Mary Baker—
cures reported by, examined: cancer, 140; consumption, 140–1; crushed bones, 143–4; enteritis, 142; heart disease, 160–1; hip disease, carious bone, etc., 145–6; ulcerated bowels, 144–5.
defense of, against charge of plagiarism, 46.
disclaimer of, examined, 68–9.
does not heal sickness now, 40.
egotism of, 48–50.
expository tactics of, 286.
face of, made to resemble Christ's in picture, 60.
homœopathy practiced by, before discovery of Christian Science, 42–3.
identity of, with sun-clad woman of apocalypse, claimed, 89–90.
ignorance of, exposed, 51–2.
infallibility claimed by, 54–5.
life of, prior to "discovery" of Christian Science, 42–6.
logic, specimen of her, examined, 163.
never made specialty of healing, 139.
patients referred to students by, 139–40.
plagiarism charged against others by, 47.
regarded a new Theophany, 62–5, 72, 290–1.
rhetoric, brilliant example of her, 210.
teaching of, considered the Bread of Life, 63.
teaching of, how received, 64–5.
testimony of, against herself, 46.
vanity of, 50.
worshipped, 63–4.
Faith healers, error of, 110.
Faith healing, accounted for, 109–10–14, *et seq.*
compared with Christian Science healing, 112–13.
instances of, 103, *et seq.*
Flournoy, D. D., Rev. Parke P., opinion of, as to dangers of Christian Science heresy, 20.
Foreordination, scouted by Mrs. Eddy, 254.
Fox Sisters, imposture of, confessed and explained, 14.
Frederic, Harold, death of, under Christian Science treatment, 167.

Freedom, of diet, exercise, etc., benefits of, 125.
Future life, Christian Science doctrine of, 255, *et seq.*
Gassner, Joseph, faith cures by, 103.
Glossary, Mrs. Eddy's, 287, 300–1.
Gnosticism, doctrines of, identical with those of Christian Science and Theosophy, 264–5.
referred to in New Testament, 263.
revived by Christian Science and Theosophy, 265–6.
God, definition of, according to Christian Science, 182.
immanence of, denied by Christian Science, 216.
personality of, denied by Christian Science, 182, *et seq.*, and 229.
Greek Church, cures in, by faith, relics, etc., 105.
Headache, cured by application of silver dollar, 119.
Heart disease, case of, reported cured by Mrs. Eddy, 160.
often simulated by indigestion, 148.
Heathen medicine men, cures by, 106.
Hodges, Dr., cures nausea by hypnotism, 128.
Hohenlohe, Prince, faith cures by, 102–3.
Holmes, Dr. Oliver Wendell, opinion of, as to homœopathy, phrenology, etc., 43.
Hughes, Mrs. John H., case of rheumatism of, cured by earthquake, 120.
Hymnology, Christian Science, specimen of, 270.
Hypnotism, compared with Christian Science methods, 132–5.
curative powers of, 127–8.
modus operandi of, 127, 129.
nature of, explained, 129–30.
Hypochondria, case of, mistaken for tumor, 148.
simulation of various diseases by, 147–8.
Hysteria, simulation of various diseases by, 147–8.
Idiocy, case of, cured by trephining skull, 174.
congenital, facts of, conclusive against Christian Science, 175–6–7.
Immorality, caused by Christian Science, 214–15.
Incantations of heathen priests cure disease, 106.
Incredulity, spirit of, sometimes makes liable to imposture, 131.

Indigestion, simulation of other diseases by, 148.
Ingham, James, certificate of, examined, 140–1.
Insane, hallucinations of, 99.
Insanity caused by Christian Science, 214.
Jesus, an idea, according to Christian Science, 202.
a sentimental patriot, according to Christian Science, 196.
conception and birth of, spiritual and not physical, according to Christian Science, 202.
death of, denied by Christian Science, 200–1.
divinity of, denied by Christian Science, 203.
exists not only as diffused thought, according to Christian Science, 204–5.
humanity of, now non-existent, 203–4.
not the Christ, according to Christian Science, 203.
not the only begotten Son, according to Christian Science, 207–9.
pre-incarnation of, taught by Mrs. Eddy, 194.
saves us by poising before us as a model, according to Christian Science, 195.
sufferings of, denied by Christian Science, 195.
sufferings of, hypnotic illusions, according to Mrs. Eddy, 200.
worship of, idolatrous, according to Christian Science, 207–9.
Johnson, Dr. James, opinion of, as to doctors, drugs, etc., 44.
Joints, contracted, cured by faith, 203–5.
Kershaw, Thomas G., a Science healer, dies under "absent treatment," 166.
Key to Scriptures, Mrs. Eddy's, 286–91.
King, touch of, a cure for scrofula, 105–6.
Knight, Newell, case of, cured by Joseph Smith, Jr., 107.
Knitting needles, cure of rheumatism by, 119.
Krackowitzer, Dr., cure of hysteria by, 119–20.
Lameness, cures of, by faith, relics, etc., 103–5.
Limbs, amputated, restored by Christ, 151.
amputated, cannot be restored by Christian Science, nor grow again, 89.

Lobster's claw, reproduction of, Mrs. Eddy's argument from, 89.
Man, accountability of, denied by Christian Science, 232.
brotherhood of, how established in Christian Science and Theosophy, 258–9.
definition of, by Mrs. Eddy, 213.
eternal and infinite, according to Mrs. Eddy, 213.
is God, according to Mrs. Eddy, 226.
never created, according to Christian Science, 213–219.
never fell, according to Christian Science, 226.
not to be confounded with Adamic race, 226.
perfect and sinless, according to Mrs. Eddy, 233–4.
personality of, denied, 229–231.
preëxistence of, affirmed by Christian Science, 250–1.
re-incarnation of, affirmed by Mrs. Eddy, 255.
re-incarnation of, doctrine of, sad, 257–8.
Manheim, Dorothea Trudel's cures at, 103.
Marston, Dr., his account of the origin of the pharmacopœia, 94–5.
Maternity, peculiar teaching of Mrs. Eddy as to, 244.
Matthew, Father, faith cures by, 103.
McGuire, Dr. Hunter, case of neurasthenia cured by, 122.
Medicines, rest from, sometimes beneficial, 124–5.
Mental Factors in Cause and Cure of Diseases, 114.
Mind-cure, basis of, in natural law, 114.
Ministry, Christian, obnoxious to Mrs. Eddy, 81.
Miracles of Christian Science, 139–152.
of Christian Science, differences between and those of Christ and his apostles, 151–2.
of Mormonism, 106–8.
Modesty, a "delusion of material sense," according to Mrs. Eddy, 92.
Mormon, Book of, plagiarized by Joseph Smith, 13.
Mormonism, growth of, 13–14.
Morphine habit, cured by hypnotism, 128.
Mortals not man, according to Mrs. Eddy, 226.
Murchison, Dr., testimony of, as to mental cause and cure of liver disease, 115.

Natural causes for alleged cures, 111, 115.
Nature, healing force of, 117.
Nausea, cured by application of silver dollar, 119.
cured by hypnotism, 129.
Nervous agencies in cause and cure of liver disease, 115.
Neuralgia, cure of, by hypnotism, 128.
Neurasthenia, cure of, by whipping, 122; by hypnotism, 127.
Neuritis, ulnar, cure of, by hypnotism, 127.
New York School of Primitive and Practical Christian Science, 283.
Oil, anointing with, 103, 111.
Oneida Communists, cure by criticism practiced by, 122–123.
Ovarian tumor, simulated by hysteria, 148.
Pantheism, cheerlessness of, 257.
defined, 188.
taught by Christian Science, 188, 226, 238–9.
Paralysis, cured by hypnotism, 127; by shock, 120; by suggestion and ridicule, 123: by thermometer, 118.
Pardon, Christian doctrine of, scouted by Mrs. Eddy, 254, 275.
Paris, Dr., opinion of, as to incompatible ingredients in prescriptions, 124.
Payne, Dr. R. L., quoted, 115, 155–6.
Pennypacker, Judge, decision of, in Christian Science case, 15.
Personality, defined, 184.
of God denied by Christian Science, 182, *et seq.*
of man denied by Christian Science, 227–230.
Perkins, Dr., cures by, with tractors, 118.
Philosophy, Christian Science, absurdities of, 84, *et seq.*
Pythagorean, revived in Christian Science, 182.
Physicians, possibility of incorrect diagnosis by, 139, 148.
Physiognomy, suggestions from, 116–17.
Poisons, effects of, how accounted for by Christian Science, 84–5.
Post-mortem examinations, show spontaneous recovery from consumption, 117.

Practice, Christian Science, rules for, 164, *et seq.*
Prayer, consists in what, according to Mrs. Eddy, 276–7; according to Madame Blavatsky, 274; defined by our Lord, 278; for healing, not necessarily answered by miracle, 111; for sick, warrant for, in Scriptures, 109–11; for a dyspeptic (Christian Science), 283; limitations of, 110; Lord's, as translated into "new tongue" of Christian Science, 279–83; no real, in Christian Science worship, 276–7–8; vocal, not allowed in Christian Science churches, 277–8.
Prescriptions, ingredients of, fighting together in the dark, 124–5.
Protestant faith healers, cures by, 103–4.
Pythagoras, teaching of, followed by Christian Science, 182.
Quimby, Dr. P. P., author of term, "Christian Science," 145.
originator of mental science healing, 44–5–6.
treatment of Mrs. Eddy by, for palsy, 45.
tribute of Mrs. Eddy to, 46.
Raising the dead, not attempted by Christian Science healers, 151.
Reed, Dr. Charles A. L., challenge of, to Mrs. Eddy, 149–150.
Relics, cures by, 104–5.
Relapses, ignored in Christian Science practice, 158.
Resistance, moral, necessary in cure of morphine habit, etc., 128.
Rhetoric, specimen of Mrs. Eddy's best, 210.
Rheumatism, cured by hypnotism, 127; by knitting needles, 119; by scalding, 120; by shock, 115, 120.
Rhode Island, Supreme Court of, decision of, in Christian Science case, 15–16.
Rhubarb, dream of taking, effective as purgative, 147.
taste and effects of, communicated to jelly by imagination, 116.
Roman Catholic faith healers, cures by, 103.
Roman Catholic relics and miraculous waters, cures by, 105.
Sacramental forms, doctrinal import of, 268.
Sacraments, Christian Science, 271–3.

Science and Health, considered equal or superior to Bible, 53–4.
exalted claims of, 53–8.
inspiration claimed for, 53.
literary character of, 49, 50–2–3–4.
miraculous, 55–6.
quoted. See AUTHORS.
said to be the "little book" of Revelation x., 73.
said to be the Christ, 54.
said to be the Good Shepherd, 54.
title of, seductive, 35.
Scientific methods of investigation, ignored by Mrs. Eddy, 165.
Scriptures, the, contradiction of, by Mrs. Eddy, 186–9, 192, 195–8, 208–13–18–23–26.
Mrs. Eddy's interpretations of, 285, *et seq.*
Scurvy, cured by delusion, 121.
Second Adventists, origin of, 13.
Self-mesmerization, 128.
Shakerism, origin of, similar to that of Christian Science, 70–1.
Simpson, Rev. A. B., cures by, 104.
Sleep-walking, in same category with hypnotic trance, 130.
Smollet, cure of consumption reported by, 122.
Sovereigns, touch of illegitimate, could cure scrofula, 106.
Spine, disease of, sometimes imaginary, 148.
disease of, cured by hypnotism, 128.
Spinoza, philosophy of, identical with that of Christian Science, 188.
Spirit-rappings, origin of, 14.
Spiritualism, origin of, in imposture, 14.
Stigmatization, facts of, accounted for, 116.
Suggestion, power of, 135–7; uses of, in Christian Science, 132–3.
Sullivan, Mrs., case of, 121.
Sunshine from cucumbers, a Christian Science possibility, 84.

Superstitions of Christian Science, 243.
of Mrs. Eddy, 46.
Surgery, Christian Science, a failure, 89–90.
Talmage, D. D., Rev. T. DeWitt, vigor of, 99.
Teeth, pain in ulcerated, relieved by application of silver dollar, 119.
Theosophy, origin of modern, in imposture, 14; teachings of, similar to those of Christian Science, 245, *et seq.*; terms of, identical with those of Christian Science, 246–7.
Thermometer, cure of paralysis by, 118.
Thought, transference of, taught by Mrs. Eddy, 159, 243–4; by hypnotists, 161.
Thrashing, cures by, 122.
Time and space annihilated by thought, according to Christian Science, 160.
Tobacco habit, cured by hypnotism, 128.
Trance state, produced in Dr. Buckley's experiment, 127, 130.
simulation of acts in, 127, 130.
Treatment, absent, 160; Christian Science rules for, 153.
Tuke, Dr., admits faith cures by Prince Hohenlohe, 102; by relics, etc., 105.
Tumor, supposed ovarian, relieved by administration of ether, 148.
Typhoid fever, cured by Mrs. Eddy with diluted salt water, 42.
Van Der Mye, Dr. Frederick, testimony of, as to effect of delusion in epidemic of scurvy, 121.
Van Swieten, report by, of consumption, cured by falling into water, 122.
Vapor bath, mistake in, cures rheumatism, 120.
Vertebræ, dislocated, cured by Christian Science, 89.
Vertebrata, created by "mortal and material thought," according to Mrs. Eddy, 220.
Vincent, D. D., Rev. Marvin R., report by, of a case of supposed tumor relieved by ether, 148.
Vis medicatrix naturæ, 117.

Vosburg, Rev. Arthur, apology of, for Christian Science worship of Mrs. Eddy, 72.
Weather, Christian Science an alleged remedy for, 90.
William III., refused to touch for "King's Evil," 105-6.
Wilmans, Helen, statement of, as to transference of thought, 159.
specimen treatment by, 162.
Witch doctors, negro, may cause or cure diseases, 106.
Wood, Dr., on influence of mind on body, 114-15.
Woodbury, Mrs. J. C., character and prominence of, in ranks of Christian Science, 65; quoted, see AUTHORS; recantation of, 65-6.
Wordsworth, William, on preëxistence of soul, 252.
Worms, cystic, in brain, effects of, 175.
in children, how accounted for by Christian Science, 88; and cured, 88.
tape, may cause nervous and mental disturbances, 175.
Youth, how to retain indefinitely, according to Christian Science, 96-7.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 022 216 726 7